

FORUM

Meighen Redivivus

Editorial

A "Newspaper" Fights A Miners' Strike

Arnold E. Brown

Conscription---For What?

Fergus Glenn

Canada Calling

George Hambleton

Vermont Graveyard

Drawing by Carl Schaefer

Poems---Book Reviews

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

EDITORIALS	291
MEIGHEN REDIVIVUS	293
MR. KING AND LABOR POLICY	
EUGENE FORSEY	296
THE STRIKE AT KIRKLAND LAKE	
G. M. A. GRUBE	299
A NEWSPAPER FIGHTS A STRIKE	
ARNOLD E. BROWN	301
CIVIL LIBERTIES	304
SUFFER LITTLE CHILDREN (POEM)	
RITA ADAMS	304
VERMONT GRAVEYARD (DRAWING)	
CARL SCHAEFER	305
CONSCRIPTION—FOR WHAT?	
FERGUS GLENN	306
CANADA CALLING	
GEORGE HAMBLETON	309
THE PEOPLE VERSUS THE MASSES	
FRANK H. UNDERHILL	311
O CANADA	313
ELEGY IN A SUBURBAN CHURCHYARD	
LEO KENNEDY	313

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

A GENERATION OF MATERIALISM	Frank H. Underhill	314
STARS AND STRIKES	Frank Fraser	314
LAND AND LABOR	D. C. S.	315
SATAN IN TOP HAT	G. C. Andrew	315
THE STORY OF MODERN ART	Helen Frye	316
WAR AND THE GERMAN MIND	M. W.	316
SPENLOVE IN ARCADY	Robin Tealey	317
RED PLANES FLY EAST	M. T.	317
AT SUMMER'S END	Alan Creighton	318
PRIMER INFORME PRESIDENCIAL	Josephine Hambleton	318
OXFORD PERIODICAL HISTORY OF WAR	C. M.	318
BOOKS RECEIVED		319

THE CANADIAN FORUM
 Eleanor Godfrey - Managing Editor
 L. A. Morris - Business Manager
 SUBSCRIPTION RATE: TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM
 (Cheques must be payable at par in Toronto)
 Published each month by
 THE CANADIAN FORUM LTD.
 28 Wellington Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
 Phone WA 5118

LSR The League for Social Reconstruction is an association of men and women who are working for the establishment in Canada of a social order, in which the basic principle regulating production, distribution and service will be the common good rather than private profit.

ITS AIMS ARE— To stimulate discussion of current social problems through public meetings. To encourage the reading and study of works on economic, political, and international affairs. To make knowledge and reason, instead of habit and sentiment, the basis of constructive criticism of Canadian society. To break down prejudice and build up a social faith.

(L.S.R. membership fee for one year and one year subscription to The Canadian Forum—\$3.00)

Write for information to

NATIONAL OFFICE
 33½ Thorncliffe, Toronto, Ontario

NEWS

HAS NO INHIBITIONS --
 NO BIAS. IT GIVES AND
 INTERPRETS THE FACTS
 YOU WANT TO KNOW
 BUT DO NOT FIND IN THE
 DAILY PRESS.

Judith Robinson
 writes for **NEWS** each week in
"This Space"



On sale at all newsstands each Friday.



NEWS Editorial and Business Offices:

63 Wellesley Street, Toronto.
 Telephone RA. 5021

THE CANADIAN FORUM

VOL. XXI

OSHAWA, ONTARIO, JANUARY, 1942

NO. 252

Best Wishes for the New Year

FOR THE FORUM, we wish merely omniscience and the funds to become a weekly.

For our editors and staff, we wish continued success in the battle of the deadline.

To our contributors we wish to express our thanks.

For our subscribers (who are obviously the best informed of Canadians) we wish the opportunity of making use of their information and capacities.

For Canada we wish that it may not always trail, governmentally, in the wake of history.

For the world, we wish a settlement of reason, on the basis of an allied victory.

For Hitler, Mussolini and all who distrust the common man, we wish oblivion.

Unity Now

WITH THE EARLY EXCITEMENT over Japan's 'efficient treachery' dying down, and the wonderment abating over America's unified acceptance of war with all the Axis powers, attention is once more becoming focussed upon the U.S.S.R.—for undoubtedly the U.S.S.R. holds the key position in the present global conflict.

Time alone can explain—and will eventually, we hope, repair—the naval disasters which overtook both the British and American forces in the face of the Japanese attack. It can only be of academic interest to know how the responsible British authorities managed to disregard the naval lessons Britain itself had taught the world at Taranto, and has since consistently practised in the Mediterranean, unless those lessons still remain unlearnt in the Far East. Capital ships are extremely valuable; but capital ships must have the same degree of protection against air attack as they have been in the habit of receiving against sea attack. Again, the official investigation into the state of unpreparedness at Pearl Harbour may reveal much of interest to the historian, but as we listened to the

enumeration of wanton and unannounced acts of aggression of the Axis powers, listed by President Roosevelt in his address to Congress, we could only hope that the lesson of preparedness had now been learnt. Remember Pearl Harbour certainly—but not in the "It-can't-happen-here" frame of mind in which Pearl Harbour remembered Port Arthur.

Even as the Japanese attacked America's outlying bases, and the isolationist groups in the States started clothing themselves in stripes, with stars in their hair, Germany launched a well-timed psychological offensive on the American home front. Russia, it seemed, had made one of several bargains with Germany, so the rumors ran. A new bloc, Germany, Russia, Japan, was in the process of formation—and several other variations on the same theme. These attempts to spread discord where some suspicion still exists (witness in Canada the private war which the Toronto Telegram is carrying on with the U.S.S.R.) though they may do a great deal of harm, must inevitably fail, unless ineptitude of the first quality controls the foreign office in London and the state department in Washington.

Quite apart from the fact that neither Britain nor the U.S.A., if they were so minded, could do Russia one iota the harm her military neighbor Germany can, the enormous war dead of Russia would now overthrow even Stalin if he attempted a saw-off with Hitler, and there is no evidence that he intends one. On the contrary, the scope and violence of the Russian counter-attacks are the most powerful possible deterrent to Hitler's obviously planned winter lunge west and south. If the Germans cannot stabilize an eastern European winter line, the western attack may prove abortive, or, if the British offensive in Libya gathers sufficient speed to the borders of French North Africa, it may even fail to come off.

That Russia has not declared war on Japan, as Mr. Litvinoff pointed out in a refreshingly clear utterance for diplomatic circles, proves nothing

except that she has a pretty completely engrossing problem on her hands already. It is, however, not unlikely that Germany will try to force Japan to attack Russia in Manchuria in order to relieve pressure on Germany in the west.

The allied counter move to Goebbel's discord propaganda should be the immediate establishment of an inter-allied high command and policy-making council. It is too late to be half-hearted or faint-hearted. The shape of the future must be hammered out by inter-allied cordial collaboration now—or the future will have no shape at all. As we go to press, the first moves in this direction appear to be taking place in Washington.

New Ministers

MR. KING in the past has shown at least one remarkable similarity to that redoubtable warrior, Mr. Winston Churchill. This is his fondness for cabinet reconstructions which do nothing but shuffle around a few mediocre party hacks. But in choosing a lawyer so distinguished and cultivated as Mr. St. Laurent for his new minister of justice he has shown unexpected imagination. We hope that the appointment of Mr. Humphrey Mitchell to the labor department also promises well. Does the release of Mr. C. S. Jackson mean that we are at last to see a new spirit in the relations of the government lawyers and policemen with the Canadian industrial working-class?

Washington

UNITED MORE FIRMLY than ever before in their history, the citizens of the United States seem determined to fight through to ultimate victory over the forces of fascism. This solidarity was achieved, however, in the white heat of anger at Japanese treachery, and if it is to be maintained during the course of what must be a long-term struggle some more permanent basis must be supplied. If Mr. Roosevelt and his colleagues can supply this basis they will have provided their country with the one kind of armament which, more even than bombers and battleships and tanks, will ensure the ultimate triumph of the forces fighting for world freedom.

The old antagonisms between labor and industry, Britannia-phobes and -philes, new dealers and old guard, must not be allowed to revive. National unanimity will be far more effective than legislation as a check on strikes. The men who are being drafted into the armed forces will cheerfully volunteer that full measure of devotion which

cannot be conscripted if they can be sure that their fellows in the factories and on the farms are being adequately protected from profiteers and that the social gains of our generation will not have to be rewon after the war. Furthermore they have a right to expect their statesmen to plan for the peace they are fighting to achieve. The task which confronts the president is Herculean. Unfortunately he cannot count on the remembrance of Pearl Harbour as a permanent gag on the ex-isolationists, temporarily silenced by national peril. Fortunately Mr. Roosevelt is a statesman of no ordinary stature and the great majority of Americans is solidly behind him.

Goodbye Mr. Pattullo

AS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT begins to assume the full weight of its task of national leadership we may well expect a decline of Canadian sectionalism and the defeat of those provincial leaders whose chief claim to national attention has been based on their clashes with federal policies. The first to tumble, though not necessarily the most deserving victim, was Mr. Duff Pattullo, the recently retired leader of the British Columbia Liberals. As one of those who participated in the scuttling of—and from—the dominion-provincial conference called to consider the Sirois report, he made the nation's headlines and editorial pages. The provincial election he engineered in November, and which back-fired, stripping him of his working majority in the provincial house, brought his name to the fore again. His subsequent resignation from the party leadership, because of rank and file insistence on a coalition with the Conservatives, has drawn no tears, for this union of old line parties, opposed by a strengthened C.C.F., removed much of the ambiguity from provincial politics. It may well be that here for the first time in Canada, we see the real political alignment of the future.

History will probably not convert Mr. Pattullo's notoriety into fame. Not even within his own province (despite the fine bridge which bears his name) has he left an indelible mark on the public memory. Some may remember his campaign pledge of 'Work and Wages' before an earlier provincial election, but only because of his failure to fulfil it. Others may associate his name with the health insurance fiasco. Few are likely to couple his name with the more creditable achievements of his administration; notably in the department of education under the able direction of Dr. Weir. Yet he deserves a share of praise for these, just as he must accept the major portion of the blame for the shortcomings of his government.

Lapointe-Rowell

IT WAS a mournful coincidence that the two great Liberals, each the outstanding Liberal in his province, Lapointe in Quebec and Rowell in Ontario, should have died at almost the same time. The name of Chief Justice Rowell was connected with the main attempt that we have made since Confederation to bring our federal institutions up to date and so make the relations between the different sections of Canada happier and more harmonious. Mr. Lapointe's reputation will rest upon his success in holding his own province and the rest of Canada together in the great crisis of the present war. Twice in quick succession, at the outbreak of the war and when M. Duplessis tried to capture Quebec for disruptive purposes, he intervened decisively to give a lead to his French Canadians, and we can now see that his actions did more than those of any other statesman to preserve Canadian unity in a critical period. Yet, when we use this language, we are conscious that we are indulging in rhetorical exaggeration. Canadian unity is not in any secure position at this moment, and its real testing time will come when we begin to feel the pressure of the war with genuine severity. Mr. Lapointe, however, does at this distance seem to have expressed substantially the overwhelming majority opinion of his community. It is not in Quebec but in Ontario that dangerous disruptive forces are most likely to wreck what Canadian unity we have achieved. For the liberalism of Mowat and Blake, of which Mr. Rowell was the last great spokesman, is either dead or it is numbed into unconsciousness in Ontario. It was the Ontario government which defeated the work of Mr. Rowell, and it is from Ontario that we may expect an eruption of the bigots and the gangsters who see in this war only an opportunity for seizing power.



Meighen Redivivus

HE COMES of Ulster stock; and some people would say that the bitter intolerant spirit which is what the name of Meighen connotes to most Canadians is just the bad Ulster inheritance becoming more dominant in him each year as he grows older. But it is probably truer to say that it is his Toronto environment which is showing its influence more and more. He settled in Toronto in 1927 when he made his first retirement from public life. We hope that the electors of South York will assist him to make a second retirement in 1942. For it is clear that the Belfast of Canada has always been his spiritual home. The *Globe and Mail* in the mornings and the *Telegram* in the evenings exemplify pretty completely his social and moral if not his intellectual standards.

He is an honest man according to his lights. He has never been able to hide what he really believes. And when he goes out to other parts of Canada and tries to persuade them that he stands for wider and more generous views and policies than are included in the Toronto way of life, he only succeeds in convincing them that he is a jesuitical casuist. So let him stay in Toronto. In the long run both he and the rest of the country will be happier thus. He symbolizes and fanatically believes in everything that makes Toronto detested by the rest of Canada.

As a politician Mr. Meighen's great weakness has always been that he becomes so concentrated upon the victory of the moment that he forgets the price at which momentary victories may be purchased. His intensity makes him see very clearly, but it also prevents him from focussing his gaze more than one inch in front of his nose. In the last war he was the chief engineer who devised, for the benefit of the Borden government, the closure, the Military Voters Act, the War Times Elections Act, the coercion of Quebec. For the moment the device of enfranchising just enough women and disfranchising just enough "foreigners," and of distributing the soldier ballots in the constituencies where they would do most good to the government, produced a glorious victory. But the events of 1917 left a widespread conviction that Arthur Meighen is a politician who will stop at nothing for the sake of victory, and he has been paying for this ever since.

So again he defeated himself in 1926. He had been laboriously building up the Conservative machine after the disaster of 1921, he had been sedulously courting Quebec—the Hamilton speech came in November, 1925—and the explosion of

the customs scandal in the 1926 session gave him his great chance to recover his reputation as a political leader. But he threw it all away because he was too greedy for a victory at the moment. When Mr. King, with a vote of censure facing him in the Commons, failed to get the governor-general's consent to a dissolution, the Tories could not, even for a few weeks, suppress their eagerness to enjoy the spoils of office. They rushed in to support the governor-general's stand, only to find that they also had to ask him for a dissolution within a couple of days; and thereby they supplied Mr. King with a magnificent personal grievance and a plausible constitutional issue by which he was able to distract public attention from the customs misdeeds of his own government and to fight the election on the favoritism of the English governor and the iniquity of the Meighen shadow cabinet. Never was any leader so completely outmanoeuvred as was Mr. Meighen in 1926.

The same incapacity for looking ahead came out in his handling of the customs scandal itself. Here were revelations pointing to a most serious state of corruption in one great branch of the government service, and calling aloud to all friends of good government for further investigation. But Mr. Meighen was interested only in an immediate party triumph. He concentrated his attack upon the unfortunate Mr. Boivin, the French-Canadian minister of customs who had taken over a mess in his department and had not cleaned it up vigorously enough. Mr. Meighen tore him to pieces and won a brilliant debating victory; but anyone sitting in the gallery could see the French members slowing freezing in hatred of their old enemy of 1917. And when the election came Mr. King collected his usual sixty seats in Quebec province.

Mr. King wins elections because he is always looking ahead. Mr. Meighen wins debates and loses elections because he is always concentrated upon the event of the moment. Fate played him a shabby trick when he convinced himself that he was meant to be a statesman. He was meant to be an advocate in court.

A review of some aspects of Mr. Meighen's career in the past shows how unfitted he is to be a leader of Canada in our present situation. Consider his stand on questions of social reform. In 1926 when Grits and Tories were both courting the support of the Progressives, Mr. Woodsworth asked Messrs. King and Meighen for a statement of their policy on old age pensions. The first promised, if sustained in office, to introduce an old age pensions measure. The second failed to give any satisfaction whatever. So Mr. Woodsworth

supported Mr. King, who in due course carried out his promise. The Conservatives were afraid to oppose the measure directly in the Commons, and contented themselves with sniping at it. In the Senate they used their party majority to throw it out. The old gentlemen of the upper chamber, each of whom was enjoying an old age pension of \$4,000 a year, filled the pages of Hansard with their solicitude lest old age pensions might undermine the sturdy independence of spirit of the Canadian working-man. Next year, 1927, after a general-election victory for Mr. King, the Meighenites let the measure through.

If you examine Mr. Meighen's speeches during the depression you will find that their main theme is his fear lest social legislation to help the unemployed should encourage too many poor people to depend upon government assistance. When, however, the depression hit him himself, and his career in finance was not going so well, he showed no reluctance about accepting a little government assistance in maintaining his own standards of living. And he became a Hydro-Electric commissioner at \$10,000 a year and a senator at \$4,000. When the government of his party under Mr. Bennett adopted unemployment insurance and other "New Deal" measures, he could do nothing but give them verbal support, though he still harped in the Senate on the danger of encouraging dependence on the state. But just last year, 1940, when at last an unemployment insurance measure was put on the statute books about the constitutionality of which there was no doubt, Mr. Meighen divided the Senate against it. He professed approval of the principle, but wanted the measure put off till after the war. If we in Canada, long after most other industrial countries, have made a beginning of old age pensions and unemployment insurance, our industrial population owe no thanks to Arthur Meighen. On the other hand they can thank him for the infamous section 98 of the criminal code, now abrogated in spite of his opposition.

The question on which Mr. Meighen's stand has been most enlightening has been that of participation in British wars. The years from 1914 to 1918 convinced Quebec that he was a fanatical imperialist—which he is—and that such a man could not be trusted for the future. In 1922, when the Lloyd George government almost got into another war with Turkey and when they cabled asking if they could count on Canadian participation, Mr. King refused to commit himself until parliament had been called and had expressed its will. Mr. Meighen declared: "Let there be no dispute as to where I stand. When Britain's

message came, then Canada should have said, 'Ready, aye ready; we stand by you.' " Naturally, this only confirmed the feeling of Quebec about him, and the pledge of automatic involvement in British wars—for this was what his words seemed to mean—lost him support in many other parts of Canada also. He has been explaining the "ready, aye ready" speech ever since. His latest effort is contained in the senate Hansard for May 29, 1940:

Senator Meighen—We should at once have shown interest in that treaty (of Sevres), and stood ready to examine with her (Great Britain) our course of action. Never did I say that we should have been ready to fight at once merely because Great Britain thought of fighting.

Senator Dandurand—But my honourable friend said he would have replied 'ready, aye ready.'

Senator Meighen—Certainly, but I did not say 'ready, aye ready to fight merely if called upon.'

Senator Euler—What did the statement mean then?

Senator Meighen—It meant that we should have replied that we were ready, aye ready for an examination, in a sympathetic attitude, of our duty.

Senator Euler—Nobody else interpreted it that way.

So the "ready, aye ready" speech doesn't sound quite so heroic today as it did in 1922 when it was first delivered before the Toronto Conservative Business Men's club. To be ready to examine our duty in a sympathetic spirit sounds, indeed, a good deal like Mr. Mackenzie King. The ultimate fact about Canadian politics is that a political leader who expects to collect votes outside of Toronto becomes a good deal like Mr. Mackenzie King.

Mr. Meighen quickly realized how few votes "ready, aye ready" was likely to get him in those parts of Canada which had not been nourished on a daily diet of the Toronto *Telegram*. And after the 1925 election, when the two old parties were fairly evenly balanced without either having a clear majority, he decided that if he were to come into office he would have to make clear to Quebec that "ready, aye ready" didn't mean what everybody took it to mean. If he could win some support from Quebec—in which province he had not ventured to appear during the 1925 election—he could oust Mr. King from the prime ministership. So he took advantage of a by-election in Bagot to make an offer to Quebec. In his famous Hamilton speech of Nov. 16, 1925, he declared that if he were head of the government when another war broke out and if he decided to support Britain in the war, he would dissolve parliament and seek the approval of the Canadian people for his policy before any Canadian troops were sent overseas.

The Hamilton speech failed completely of its purpose. It didn't win Quebec from its attitude of suspicion and hostility; and, since it seemed obviously to be backing away from the "ready, aye ready" policy, it infuriated the loyalist Tories

of Ontario. In vain did the unhappy Mr. Meighen explain that it meant no change in his own or his party's lifelong attitude of support for Britain, but only a change in the procedure by which that support would be expressed. In vain did he declare his confidence that a government going to the people on such an issue would receive an overwhelming mandate for its policy, and that an election would occasion no delay in the effective war effort of the country. It was enough for the enraged Tories that he had recognized the right of the Canadian people to exercise an option about participation in British wars. As the *Winnipeg Free Press* put it, "In the face of this momentous, radical, revolutionary, bolshevist, treasonable proposition, it was futile for Mr. Meighen to plead that, with a Conservative government in power, there should be no fear as to how the option would be exercised." It took years for the Tories of Ontario to forgive the Hamilton speech—Mr. Meighen, indeed had to give up the leadership of the party very largely because of it. And someone should ask him at one of the by-election meetings in South York whether he and the *Telegram* have reconciled their differences about his Hamilton war policy.

And now a few Toronto magnates have foisted him on the Tory party again as leader. The cabal which carried out the coup was led and directed by a little group of northern Ontario mining millionaires, with the *Globe and Mail*, the organ of this gang, supplying the publicity build-up. They are the most sinister social group in Canada today. And Mr. Meighen is a fitting choice as their spokesman. Like George McCullagh, like Mitch Hepburn, like all these frustrated Toronto megalomaniacs, he is itching to coerce somebody, to impose on the rest of Canada the Toronto way of running a war. But somehow or other the rest of Canada has never thought much of the Toronto way of doing things.



Mr. King, Parliament, the Constitution and Labor Policy

Eugene Forsey

IN THE WHOLE HISTORY of Canada, no public man has been so vociferous about "the rights of parliament" and "the supremacy of parliament" as Mr. Mackenzie King. No one has proclaimed oftener or more insistently that "parliament must" (or "will") "decide." His fervent professions of devotion to this principle have helped to put him where he is and keep him there.

If ever there was a question on which parliament ought to have been called upon to decide, war-time labor policy was that question. "Let bitterness and discontent get into the hearts of my army of workers, and then, by God, we've lost the war," says Mr. Bevin. No government with a grain of common sense, let alone the slightest regard for parliamentary institutions, would dare to adopt a policy on such a subject except by act of parliament passed after fullest possible discussion by the people's representatives. What has Mr. King done?

First, he extended the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act to all war industries. Did he ask parliament to consider the advisability of this measure? He did not. He enacted it by order-in-council, P.C. 3495, Nov. 7, 1939.

Second, he proclaimed that employees "should" (not "shall") be free to organize in trade unions and bargain collectively "through the officers of their trade unions or through representatives chosen by them." To be sure, this is a mere pious wish. It enacts nothing. But it gives the government's blessing to a very important and fundamental principle. Did Mr. King invite parliament to consider this principle? He did not. He simply issued an executive order, P.C. 2685, June 19, 1940. Parliament was in session at the time, but it was not consulted. It was merely informed that the government had acted.

Third, he laid down a far-reaching war-time wage policy, and "ordered that all agreements negotiated during the war period shall" (not "should," this time) "conform to the principles" of the war-time wage policy in question and "to the principles enunciated . . . in P.C. 2685." In other words, he severely limited the movement of wages, and made collective bargaining compulsory. These are fundamental decisions. Did parliament make them? No. They were enacted by order-in-council, P.C. 7440, Dec. 16, 1940, just ten days after parliament had been prorogued.

Fourth, he set up an Industrial Disputes Inquiry Commission. This amounted to a major amendment of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. Did "parliament decide" that this amendment should be made? It did not. Mr. King made it by order-in-council, P.C. 4020, June 6, 1941. Parliament was in session, but Mr. King ignored it.

Fifth, he vested the minister of labor with power to issue "whatever order he deems necessary" to give effect to any recommendations made by the Industrial Disputes Inquiry Commission in regard to anti-union discrimination or discharges, or coercion to join a union; such order to be "final and binding upon the employer and employees and any other persons concerned." This places in the hands of the minister very sweeping powers, exercisable without any parliamentary guidance or effective control. Did parliament confer these powers? No. Mr. King and his colleagues conferred them by order-in-council, P.C. 4844, July 2, 1941. Parliament was not consulted.

Sixth, he enacted that, *after* a board of conciliation under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act has reported, employees shall not go on strike (if the minister of labor thinks a strike would interfere with the efficient prosecution of the war) till a strike vote has been taken "under the supervision of the Department of Labor upon and subject to such provisions, conditions, restrictions or stipulations as the minister may make or impose;" all employees "who in his opinion are affected by the dispute or whose employment might be affected by the proposed strike shall be entitled to vote;" and unless a majority "of all those entitled to vote" votes for a strike, a strike shall be unlawful, and anyone going on strike or encouraging or aiding a strike shall be liable to heavy penalties. Moreover, the minister need not even order a vote; and if he does not, a strike is unlawful. All this is again a very important amendment to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. It is a serious invasion of the liberty of the subject and of the fundamental rights of labor. It places in the hands of the minister of labor vast and vague powers (including the power to gerrymander the constituency and pad the voters' list for strike votes), to be wielded at his sole discretion and without appeal. Did "parliament decide" all this?

No. Mr. King and his colleagues enacted it by order-in-council, P.C. 7307, Sept. 16, 1941.

Seventh, he set a "ceiling" on prices and wages, wages to be in general not higher than in the four weeks Sept. 15 to Oct. 11, 1941. The New York Times described this measure as "revolutionary," adding that the government "admitted" that the mechanism for carrying it out was not "yet in order," and that there was general surprise that "so complete and radical a measure should have been considered necessary" at a time when neither prices nor wages were rising excessively, and the economic situation appeared to be normal. Mr. King himself described the measure as of a nature "hitherto untried with the will and consent of any free people anywhere." Unquestionably, then, the enactment was very sweeping; equally unquestionably it was not urgent. Parliament was only adjourned, subject to call by telegraph at any time, and due to reassemble anyhow in a little over two weeks. There was no reason under the sun why Mr. King could not wait long enough to allow parliament to "decide" on the question. (As a matter of fact, the price-fixing order-in-council was passed just three days before parliament met.) Instead, this great champion of "the supremacy of parliament" chose to spring the thing on the country in a Saturday evening broadcast, presenting the people with a *fait accompli*, on which their representatives had never been consulted: legislation by blitz. And to crown it all, he had the effrontery to describe his action as being taken "with the will and consent of a free people!"

In the whole of the government's war-time labor policy, from start to finish, there is exactly one measure on which it has invited "parliament to decide": the bill to debar certain persons from being members of boards of conciliation. This weighty matter required submission to parliament: such trifles as collective bargaining, conciliation machinery, basic wage policy, and the right to strike could all be settled by mere executive decree, without consulting the representatives of the people.

Mr. King has given us a superb example of James Russell Lowell's

"A merciful Providence fashioned us holler
'A' purpose that we might our principles swaller." But to those who really know Mr. King's record there is nothing new in his recent behavior. Vociferous as he has always been about "the rights of parliament," no man in Canadian history has trampled on those rights so consistently and so ruthlessly. A few excerpts from his past history are instructive.

On Sept. 5, 1925, Mr. King dissolved parliament. The election took place on Oct. 29. It returned 116 Conservatives, 101 Liberals, and 28 Progressives and Independents. On Nov. 5, one week after the election, and one month and two days before the new parliament could enter on its legal existence, Mr. King, in an official statement, boldly claimed the right to an "immediate" second dissolution. This claim, utterly without precedent in the history of the British empire, would, of course, reduce parliament to a cipher. The assertion of such a claim was a gross insult to parliament and subversive of the essential principle of the constitution, which Mr. King himself, in the same statement, set forth as "the supreme right of the people to govern themselves in the manner which the constitution has provided, namely, expressing their will through their duly elected representatives in parliament." Mr. King's favorite constitutional "authority," Professor Keith, though mysteriously silent on this particular instance, has declared that a prime minister who advised a second dissolution immediately after defeat in an election would be "lacking in public duty," and that the crown could not "constitutionally grant a dissolution in such circumstances."

Mr. King, however, was for the moment content with merely proclaiming this non-existent and unconstitutional "right" to defy parliament. In the same statement, he graciously announced that "it was felt that it was not in the interests of the country" to have a second general election "until at least parliament had been summoned and the people's representatives had been afforded an opportunity of giving expression to their views." Note the "at least": as to what he would do if the "expression" went against him, he carefully refrained from committing himself. This was not one of the times when he said that "parliament would decide."

Parliament met on Jan. 7, 1926. For some months Mr. King managed to secure a parliamentary majority. On June 22 Mr. H. H. Stevens moved a motion of censure. (Mr. King subsequently denied that it was a motion of censure; but during the debate, he himself so described it no less than five times; see Hansard, 1926, pp. 5132 and 5135.) Next day, Mr. Woodsworth moved an amendment to the motion of censure, deleting the censure of the government. Mr. King and his supporters naturally voted for this, but it was defeated by a majority of two, on June 25. Mr. Fansher then moved another amendment which would merely have added to the Stevens motion certain words of Mr. Woodsworth's motion. The speaker declared

this motion out of order. His ruling was overruled by two votes. A Liberal motion to adjourn the debate was then lost by one vote, and later in the morning of June 26 a second motion to adjourn the debate was carried by one vote. The motion of censure had not yet been voted on, but Mr. King none the less tried to get a dissolution of parliament. Parliament showed signs of deciding against him, so he tried to prevent it from deciding at all. This attempt also was utterly unprecedented in the history of the British empire, and subversive of parliamentary government. It was tantamount to allowing a prisoner to discharge the jury by which he was being tried; to appeal from a lower court to a higher before the lower court could pronounce its verdict. If the governor-general had granted the request, he would have become an accomplice in a flagrant act of contempt of parliament. He would have been allowing Mr. King to do what Edward Blake denounced in 1873: "to withdraw from the cognizance of the people's representatives the great cause pending between ministers and their accusers." Lord Byng refused to allow Mr. King to violate the constitution, and thus preserved, for the time being at any rate, that "supremacy of parliament" of which Mr. King was never tired of prating but which in practice he was trying to overthrow.

Mr. King later explained that the question "which political party had the right to govern . . . was for parliament to decide, if parliament were in a position so to do; that when parliament ceased to be in a position to make a satisfactory decision, . . . it was then for the people to decide." This principle also is subversive of the constitution; for it leaves it to the prime minister to decide when and whether "parliament is in a position to make a satisfactory decision." It leaves him free to appeal from parliament to the electorate, and from the electorate to parliament, back and forth, when and as often as he pleases. It makes him a dictator, immune to expulsion from office save by his own consent.

In the course of his efforts to secure a dissolution, Mr. King even went so far as to advise Lord Byng to "cable the secretary of state for the dominions, asking the British government, from whom you have come to Canada under instructions, what, in the opinion of the secretary of state for the dominions, your course should be." This advice, a threat to the whole fabric of Canadian autonomy, violated a constitutional principle which had been established for over thirty years. Lord Byng again refused.

Having failed to get dissolution, Mr. King once more broke all precedents by abruptly resigning,

leaving the country, in his own words, with "no prime minister" and "no government." Caught red-handed in a series of attempts to violate the constitution, he set up a hue and cry against Lord Byng and Mr. Meighen. There had been 45 cases of refusal of dissolution before 1926: one in England, 44 overseas. (There have been three more since.) There had also been nine cases of refusal to give a prior pledge of dissolution: two in England, seven overseas. Many of these cases were recent: 20 of the 45 had occurred since the beginning of 1900. In all of them the request for dissolution rested on much stronger grounds than Mr. King's. Similarly, there were 16 precedents for Mr. Meighen's temporary government of ministers without portfolio: 12 cabinets consisting exclusively of ministers without portfolio, four in which (as in Mr. Meighen's) only one minister held a portfolio; and Lord Balfour, in England in 1913, had proposed to take office "for a few weeks" as "sole minister." Yet Mr. King undertook to persuade the public that Lord Byng's and Mr. Meighen's actions were unconstitutional. He was only too successful. We are now garnering the bitter fruits of that success.

But the tale is not yet complete. On Jan. 25, 1940, Mr. King brought parliament together for its usual session, only to dissolve it abruptly after a session of exactly three hours. This again was an insult to parliament, without precedent in the history of the British empire. In the course of those three hours, however, he found time for two further violations of constitutional usage. He explained that an immediate, or nearly immediate, dissolution was necessary because his government had been censured in the Ontario legislature, a doctrine which would subvert responsible government and Balkanize the nation by placing the dominion parliament at the mercy of an adverse majority in any one of nine provincial legislatures. Not content with this, he actually announced to parliament itself that he proposed to amend the election act, to make provision for the soldiers' vote, not in the proper way, by act of parliament, but by order-in-council. For brazen defiance of parliament, this last really surpasses anything in even Mr. King's record.

Mr. King's disregard of parliament in his war-time labor policy is, therefore, simply what might have been expected, the logical result of his very considerable success in setting aside the constitution whenever it got in his way. Mr. King, the defender of the constitution, is as much a fiction of his own propaganda as Mr. King, the friend of labor; and in his war-time labor policy the two are fused.

The Strike at Kirkland Lake

G. M. A. Grube

THE ONLY WAY in which the democracies can successfully fight Nazism is by the continual and planned extension of freedom. In Canada we are not doing that. Our privileged classes, and our government, which appears to be acting at the present time for the privileged classes and only for the privileged classes, seem horribly afraid to get out of the old grooves or give up for the common good any long-held privileges."

Angus MacInnis, M.P. in the House of Commons, Nov. 4th

The dispute at Kirkland Lake proves the above to be a sober statement of fact. For months, indeed for years, the gold miners of northern Ontario have struggled to obtain union recognition and the right to negotiate with their employers through representatives of their own choice. This right is recognized in theory by order in council 2685; it is recognized in practice throughout the English speaking world—in Britain, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, but apparently not in Canada unless the employer does so of his own free will. And let us be clear once more that union recognition means only a willingness to sit down at a conference table with the representatives of the union. Nothing more.

Ruthless opposition to union organization is an old habit in the mines of northern Ontario. In that paradise of unfettered capitalism and high profits reigns the most reactionary group of financiers in Canada (except that some of them don't live in Canada). They are bent on preserving their medieval privileges at whatever cost to the country, to industrial peace or to the effective prosecution of the war. That any employer should be allowed to disrupt production by a blunt refusal to sit down with and talk to the chosen representatives of his workers is almost incredible in this day and age. But that is the simple fact.

The part played by the governments, both federal and provincial, in this situation, is a disgrace. The dominion government has thrown its support on the side of the employers' attempt to break the trade union concerned, and trade unionism in general, by building up company unions that are under the domination of the employers themselves. I have analyzed this technique on a previous occasion, and exposed it for what it is. Mr. Forsey also recently showed that company unionism was the personal policy of the prime minister. The

telegram which Mr. King sent to the union the second week in December, saying that the government had exhausted every avenue of conciliation and could do no more, strongly supports that view. Whether this betrayal of the workers' cause by refusing to implement the government's own orders in council be callous indifference, cowardly withdrawal, deliberate hostility to labor, or just chronic disinclination to act, it is in any case characteristic of Mackenzie King, and in any case intolerable.

The Ontario provincial government is even more clearly aligned on the side of the owners. Not one of its spokesmen has had a word of blame for the operators who are fighting against the elementary democratic rights of their workers. On the contrary, they have taken it upon themselves to condemn the union in unmeasured language. The final proof of their partiality came when Attorney General Conant thundered against intimidation by the union when he heard a report that sticks of dynamite had been placed by the doors of some non-strikers' homes. He did not wait for any evidence as to who put them there—perhaps he has never heard of agents provocateurs?—but took the union's guilt for granted. Thus to see the highest law officer in the province allow his prejudices to run away with him was a sorry spectacle indeed. With this goes the sending of large contingents of special police against the expressed wishes, and over the protests, of the local authorities, while all reliable witnesses agree that the strikers' conduct was peaceful and responsible. The preservation of law and order is a sorry excuse for what almost amounts to provocation.

Thus, in their struggle for union recognition, the workers have against them not only the financial might of the operators, but both governments, while the press has, with very few exceptions, used its power of misrepresentation to the full. Yet how clear the story is!

It began towards the end of 1939, when a dispute at the Teck Hughes mine led to the appointment of a board of conciliation. It issued a majority report in favor of union recognition and the reinstatement of some forty-five men who had been fired for union activities. The company contemptuously ignored the findings of the board. The government did nothing. It is this experience which convinced the miners that it was useless to deal with the mine companies individually.

The union then proceeded to organize all the mines in order to seek a master agreement about wages, working conditions and union recognition with all the companies together. This is excellent

industrial practice, freely used to the advantage of all in this and other countries, when unions are strong. It is indeed specifically recognized as desirable by order-in-council 2685.

In June, 1940, the union accordingly asked the mine operators to meet them in a joint conference. They refused. The chief conciliator of the department of labor went to Kirkland Lake, and made some suggestions to make negotiations possible. The companies refused to consider them.

In July, the union took the next step and applied for a board of conciliation, to report on a number of matters regarding hours, wages and conditions of work, as well as union recognition. The Industrial Disputes Inquiry commission, under the chairmanship of Mr. Humphrey Mitchell, was sent up instead, and it is at this point that the government double-crossed the workers and showed its own partiality for company unions. The commission's suggestions, which were published, were to the effect that the union should accept the companies' plans for company unions, i.e., that every mine should deal separately with a plant committee of its own employees. Thus asked to commit suicide, and knowing full well that such a plan would deprive the men of coöordinated action, indeed of all the benefits of trade unionism in any real sense, the union naturally rejected such an infamous proposal. The only result of the commission's visit was to make plain to the operators that the government was with them, and to encourage them in their refusal to negotiate with the union.

Nothing more happened until Aug. 15, and nothing would have happened then if the men had not called a 'holiday' for the purpose of taking a strike vote. At the same time they offered to work the following Sunday so that production should not suffer, a proposal that was very reluctantly accepted by the companies.

The direct effect of this strike vote was to wake Ottawa out of its apathy, and a conciliation board was at last appointed. What happened then is still fresh in all our minds. Briefs were presented on both sides and then the operators, insolently declaring that they were unalterably opposed to any negotiations with the union, withdrew from the hearings. It is not always realized, however, that, *by refusing to give further evidence, the mine operators themselves made union recognition the only issue on which the board could report, and thus chose union recognition as the issue on which to fight.* On Oct. 15, the board unanimously reported in favor of the recognition of the union.

Once again the operators flatly refused to comply with this recommendation. The only

argument by which they support their stand is that the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union is an international union, a "C.I.O." union, and as such, untrustworthy. If this argument were worth answering, one might point out that in fact the local union is autonomous in all decisions as to strikes etc., that the union is affiliated to the Canadian Congress of Labor, that it is international in exactly the same sense as all other international unions in Canada. It is quite proper for the union to seek advice from its international officers, and the charge of 'foreign' agitators is particularly comic as coming from companies one of whose spokesmen is himself an American, and some of which are subsidiaries of American corporations. To quote the board's report: "It is our view that this is an erroneous and illogical approach to the matter."

Nothing remained now, short of government intervention, but to surrender to the operators' intransigence, or else to strike. How can any democrat blame the men if they chose to strike? But by this time order-in-council 7307 had been decreed, and a secret ballot had to be taken of all those who, in the opinion of the minister of labor, were likely to be affected by the strike. A strike was only legal after the majority of those eligible to vote had declared in favor of it.

The manner in which this vote was taken has been discussed in the last issue of the *Forum*. Suffice it to say here that no lists of voters were established by consent, or even shown to the union. Many voters were apparently included who should not have been. The ballot was framed so as to favor the operators, with its irrelevant note: "Your employer agrees to negotiate with a committee elected by the employees of the company but not with local 240 of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union," followed by the question: "Are you in favor of a strike unless the company is prepared to negotiate with local 240?" The form of the ballot was not known to the union until the evening before the vote. In fact, the whole thing was another good example of ministerial skulduggery. Nevertheless, the union got 63 percent of the eligible vote (67 percent of the vote cast) for a strike. That was on Nov. 8.

The government intimated that a strike would only be allowed in the particular mines where a majority had voted for it. It is worth noting that when a vote was taken in the Canada Packers plants in Toronto to decide between a union and a plant council, and the union did not get a majority over the whole, the union was not recognized in those plants where it got a majority. Evidently, it all depends who gets the majority.

The union then proceeded to call a strike for Wednesday, Nov. 12. At the same time they asked the minister of labor to effect a peaceful settlement. At the last minute he asked for a postponement of the strike to allow a joint conference at Kirkland Lake. The strike was postponed. After an exchange of telegrams the union was asked to send representatives to Ottawa for a conference with the government and the operators. This was done. And the crowning absurdity took place then. There were separate conferences with the government throughout Monday, Nov. 17, *but even at this stage the operators refused to meet in the same room as the miners' representatives, and the government could or would do nothing to bring them together.* It is difficult to qualify such impotence on the part of a government clothed in all the powers of the war measures act. The prime minister's telegram, already referred to, with its bland refusal to intervene, shows the same lack of spirit.

And so, let down once again by the government, the union called a strike on Nov. 18. All their efforts to secure their obvious rights by means of the conciliation machinery of the government had failed, after six months of patience. Perhaps those six months have helped to make the issue clear to all who believe in democracy and do not take their morning paper as gospel truth, never to be challenged. It is certainly so clear that no trade unionist in the country can miss it, and a large number of unions have pledged themselves to give every possible help. The need for strong trade unions, if democracy is to be saved at home, is more obvious than ever, and so is the futility of hoping for the support of old party governments in their struggles. No one who understands the issues of this war has ever doubted that democracy must be defended at home as well as abroad, for it is in danger everywhere. And on that home front the Kirkland Lake miners are at the moment in the front line. For if this battle were lost at Kirkland Lake, trade unionism in this country, and democracy with it, would receive a staggering blow.

...Who Only England Know?

(From the Manchester Guardian Weekly, Oct. 31, 1941)

"The six Canadian members of parliament who are visiting England . . . comprise three Liberals and one Conservative and the House leaders of the new Democratic party and the Coöperative Federation party . . . Another notable Canadian will be here shortly, Mr. Floyd Chambers, economist and editor of the *Financial Post*."

A "Newspaper" Fights a Miners' Strike

Arnold E. Brown

ON WEDNESDAY, NOV. 19, the Toronto Globe and Mail ran a three-line, two-column head on Page 1: "C.I.O. Union Issues Mines Strike Call at Kirkland Lake."

The news was important. The Montreal Gazette gave it an even larger play. The news accounts in the two papers differed, however, both in the story from Ottawa and that from Kirkland Lake. The Gazette printed separately, on page one, a straightforward Canadian Press story from Ottawa, The Globe and Mail also carried it, but inside, at the end of its Kirkland Lake report. Its page one Ottawa story, by its own press gallery reporter, William Marchington, began:

"While Hon. Norman A. McLarty, minister of labor, was making a final effort to arrange a joint conference of Kirkland Lake mine operators and spokesmen for the C.I.O. affiliated union with a view to forestalling a strike, word was flashed to Ottawa from Kirkland Lake that the union leaders at 5 o'clock this afternoon had called a strike, effective at 7 o'clock this evening."

The story nowhere explained, as did the Canadian Congress of Labor's statement, carried in full next day by the Gazette, that the union delegation, which went to Ottawa expecting to meet both the minister of labor and the mine operators' delegation, had all day Monday and Tuesday met only the former. Nor did it recall that, as the Globe and Mail had printed on its front page Tuesday, "the executive board of the International Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers' Union tonight (Monday) issued a statement that 'unless by 3 p.m. Tuesday, Nov. 18, satisfactory negotiations have been established' with mine operators and federal officials in Ottawa, union representatives would be withdrawn."

The Globe and Mail, however, devoted three and three-quarter columns (nearly half a page) to printing in full two statements by the mine operators, attacking the union, which is affiliated with both the C.I.O. in the United States and the C.C.L. in Canada.

The Canadian Press story from Kirkland Lake reads the same in both papers, until it comes to the point of the management-approved "panel" to be chosen after a year's company dealing with "individual committees" of the miners, should those be found unsatisfactory. There the CP story in the Gazette reads: "This was a deviation from the

stand adopted by the operators since the beginning of the dispute . . ." Instead of two paragraphs of that, the *Globe and Mail* prints one paragraph not found in the *Gazette*: "Mine operators state it is untrue that any suggestion was made that the mines would have the sole choice of outside representatives . . ." This paragraph contradicts a presumed statement which does not exist anywhere in the CP report as carried either by the *Gazette* or by the *Globe and Mail* itself.

The *Globe and Mail* also omitted two CP paragraphs about the strike's threatening to tie up gold production at "one of the richest gold fields on the continent . . . The field first came into prominence in 1911 with the discovery by W. H. (Bill) Wright of a showing of native gold on the shore of the lake. Gold built the thriving municipality of Kirkland Lake where the mines have a monthly payroll of \$793,442, and all business revolves around the industry."

W. H. (Bill) Wright is both vice-president of Wright-Hargreaves Mines Ltd. and owner of the *Globe and Mail*. The president of Wright-Hargreaves is Edwin Lang Miller of Buffalo, N.Y., an interesting fact when set beside this excerpt from a *Globe and Mail* editorial of Dec. 2: "The government of Canada cannot afford to let C.I.O. organizers from the United States come in and direct an ultimatum like this at the authorities of the land."

Following up the *Globe and Mail*'s editorial attack on the union and the C.I.O., a news story on page 1 of Nov. 20, directly beneath the Kirkland Lake story, screamed: "Lewis 'Goon Squads' Start Reign of Terror in C.I.O., Beat Up Murray Delegates." The story, from the *New York Times* correspondent in Detroit, recounted a trio of fist fights between some Lewis henchmen and some supporters of Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, at its convention. Such fist fights have occurred at A.F. of L. conventions without receiving such a play from the *Globe and Mail*.

That day's Kirkland Lake story, on the *Globe and Mail*'s front page, was carried on page 14 in the *Montreal Gazette*. Omissions in the *Globe and Mail* from the CP account as carried by the *Gazette* were from a statement by Thomas F. McGuire, union international representative: "Pickets have been at the mine gates all during the day and night and there has been a test of union strength and for every employee of the mine. Local 240 is completely satisfied with the result . . . Picketing has been absolutely peaceful . . . From all parts of Canada have come messages of greeting and understanding to the Kirkland Lake miners,

pledging support of the trade union movement from all over the dominion. Our fight here is recognized as the battle for industrial democracy against the worst kind of anti-democratic employer."

The *Globe and Mail*, though leaving out that much of the union's side of the story, printed four inches of the operators' side which the *Gazette* did not use. The *Gazette*, which once openly fired the president of the *Montreal Newspaper Guild* for union activity, can by no stretch of the imagination be called pro-union. Its editorials on the Kirkland Lake strike have been just as anti-C.I.O. as those of the *Globe and Mail*. But its news-column policy is different.

On Nov. 21 the *Gazette* and the *Globe and Mail* each printed a Canadian Press story, with quite impartial headings in each paper. But the *Globe and Mail*'s printing of the CP report omitted these sentences, used in the *Gazette*, from the second and third paragraphs: "The strike was called Tuesday night, after union men and operators, in conference with federal officials at Ottawa Monday and Tuesday, failed to reach an agreement. The dispute began when the mine operators refused to recognize the union as bargaining agent, as recommended in the unanimous report of a government conciliation board."

Having omitted that much of what the *Gazette* used, the *Globe and Mail* used two-and-a-half inches extra on a statement from a body of non-strikers called the Lake Shore Workers' Council, charging strikers with "pushing and kicking around" its members, and one inch on the union's reply.

Next day the Canadian Press dispatch, as used by the *Globe and Mail*, contained mine operators' statements in full, the union's in part; and the paper ran an editorial on the convention fight and the shooting round the U.S. captive mines, winding up with "the little fellow who pays the bills must sometimes wonder why."

Monday, the 12th, the strike was on the front page again, with Attorney-General Conant's dispatch of 190 provincial police in response to the reeve's request for what later was learned to have been about 30. Every word possible was used in the story from the parliament buildings, including full texts of everything. Union statements from Kirkland Lake that day were given almost in full. A long editorial mentioned the union's "American leader" and concluded with "The sooner this C.I.O. gang is driven out of the country the better it will be for honest labor."

Next day, on Page 1, "Will Not Tolerate Anarchy in Strike, Hepburn Declares" leapt at the reader.

the
st
G
ca
th
of
jo
In
W
de
an
mi
ab
and
rep
giv
lab
—a
bac
the
wh
bul
by
wer
pap
It
exc
how
"ye
McC
tha
ide
any
It
Ma
acti
new
"Kin
stri
eve
to d
Mail
con
Kirk
Cona
"The
of dy
old

The parliament buildings story occupied a column and a half, about one-fifth of a column being taken up with Reeve Carter's letter of protest at the excessive force sent. The Kirkland Lake story, credited to no source, was about two-to-one, in space, in favor of the mine operators.

Then came the dynamite—and, coincidentally, the first Kirkland Lake story by E. George Smith, staff writer and former managing editor of the *Globe and Mail*. His lead was "Dynamite sticks, capped, fused and 'split' for lighting, were found this morning on the doorsteps of the cottage homes of two mine workers who have remained at their jobs in preference to joining the strike of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, a C.I.O. affiliate." Followed lurid details of what would have happened to parents and infants threatened by these sticks of dynamite, none of which had its fuse burning, presumably through carelessness (amazingly unanimous and continuous, since more non-lighted sticks were reported next day). No names of thretees were given by Veteran Reporter Smith.

The choice of Smith to cover "impartially" a labor dispute involving the owner of his newspaper—a case in which one would expect a leaning-over backwards in an effort to ensure impartiality in the news columns—is interesting. It was Smith who posted a "loyalty letter" on the *Globe and Mail* bulletin board in 1937—a letter meant to be signed by all the editorial staff, saying how happy they were about their working conditions. (The *Newspaper Guild* was active at the *Globe and Mail* then.) It was signed, eventually, by all the staff in town except two women and one man—who didn't, however, lose their jobs. When labor protested the "yellow dog agreement," Publisher C. George McCullagh declared he had known nothing of it, that it had been Smith's (then managing editor) idea, and that he had no intention of using it in any way. It was not, however, publicly destroyed.

It was on Thursday, Nov. 27, that the *Globe and Mail* made a news-column statement which seems actionable. In its front-page "World at a Glance" news digest appeared this boiled-down dispatch: "Kirkland Lake—New dynamite threat by C.I.O. strikers investigated by police." No evidence had even been offered that the strikers had anything to do with the dynamite. However, the *Globe and Mail* wasn't the only one to leap at an appetizing conclusion. Parenthetically to Smith's front-page Kirkland Lake story that day, Attorney-General Conant was reported, in direct quotes, as saying: "The facts from Kirkland Lake regarding the use of dynamite indicate that the C.I.O. are up to their old and well-known tactics—terrorism. The

suggestion that the dynamite was planted by persons other than the C.I.O. agents is too absurd for comment."

Here we have both the *Globe and Mail*, whose owner owns one of the mines involved in a labor dispute, directly stating in its news columns that dynamite had been planted in such a position as to be a threat, by members of the union also party to the dispute; and the attorney-general of the province, a man supposed to speak only on the reasonably presumed authority of the people of the province, and then judicially, flatly accusing certain of those people, although no charges had been laid against anyone in that connection, of planting dynamite with intent to terrorize.

On Friday, Nov. 28, a page one, top headline read: C.I.O. Threatens To Halt Industry Over Mines Strike. Smith's story began: "A C.I.O. threat of a 24-hour disruption of Canada's national war effort was raised here tonight as the move was made to use the C.I.O.-dominated strike at the mines to menace Canadian war industries."

It would be interesting to know if a less impartial sentence ever appeared in any news columns anywhere; particularly in view of the fact that, as revealed parenthetically below, the international organizer denied that Silby Barrett, alleged to have made the threat, had done more than suggest the possibility that he might be able to persuade the Nova Scotia coal miners to take such action. A statement from J. L. Cohen, the union's counsel, disclaiming any connection on the part of the gold miners' union or other C.C.L.-C.I.O. affiliates with such a proposal was not printed by the *Globe and Mail*, although it appeared in other papers.

Incidentally, the day after the weekly *News* published an editorial condemning the *Globe and Mail*'s biased handling of that particular incident was the first day during the strike that the *Globe and Mail* printed as much of the union side as of the operators' side.

Typical of Smith's "news" handling of the strike is this excerpt from his story appearing in the *Globe and Mail* on Saturday, Nov. 29: "The best possible source said today that the strikers, despite union assurances, will find it difficult as their funds run out to get any extended credit from business institutions, however sympathetic the business principals may be, and many cases of hardship may result if the strike lasts any length of time."

That is clearly intimidation, faintly disguised as news.

Another example of intimidation is a Smith story in the Dec. 3 *Globe and Mail*, headed: Mines Need Fewer Men When Strike Is Ended. Note

that the heading is not in quotes. It is a statement by the paper, above a supposed news story.

The same day the *Globe and Mail* front-paged, under a two-column head, a Washington dispatch quoting the long-discredited Martin Dies as declaring the C.I.O. to be "marked by a coalition of communism and criminality," and that he had police records of 20 C.I.O. officers arrested for offences from petty larceny to anarchy. The *Globe and Mail* did not, however, print the C.I.O. denials, at least one of which—from the United Auto Workers—proved definitely that not one of the five alleged U.A.W. officers among the 20 had ever been connected with the U.A.W.

That, of course, is a way of intimidating union members into quitting their union.

All along, Smith has been frequently stating the numbers of miners allegedly returned to work without troubling to attribute the statement to the companies, and such headings as "1,257 Working Despite Strike" and "19 More Miners Return to Work" have appeared, without quote marks.

On Dec. 11 a front-page-begun story by Smith, occupying more than a column and a half, appeared in the *Globe and Mail*, headed "Convict Four in Strike Area" and emphasizing the magistrate's intention of imposing two 60-day jail terms on two of those convicted of intimidation. Trial for four others was adjourned. This is what the previously alleged "wholesale terrorism," played up by the *Globe and Mail* to sound as though the Kirkland Lake district were infested by homicidal maniacs, finally boiled down to: at most, six possible convictions for intimidation, in a labor dispute, three weeks old, involving 4,000 hardy miners. An impartial observer might term it a triumph for union discipline. The *Anti-labor Evening Telegram*, by the way (as we went to press it was still struck by its union truckdrivers) thought the story worth five inches of space, in contrast to the *Globe and Mail*'s 34 inches.

The *Globe and Mail* is the newspaper which, in an editorial on Saturday, March 8, 1941, headed "From the Journalistic Gutter," denounced another newspaper "with a reputation for violating every known code of newspaper ethics and all other ethics to gain its ends, which colors its news to suit its aims" as "a strange creature to pretend to principles of honest journalism . . . It doesn't know the meaning of the words."

Civil Liberties

(Compiled by the Civil Liberties Association of Toronto.)

THE MONTH JUST COMPLETED has seen a remarkably small number of convictions for offenses under the Defense of Canada Regulations. In Winnipeg, one

youth has been convicted of failing to report for military training. One Ontario man was charged with enticing a worker engaged in a war industry to leave his job, but was acquitted. One man was convicted of continuing to be a member of the Communist Party. Four men were convicted of an offense because two of them lent firearms to the other two for the purpose of hunting pheasants, but neglected to obtain the permission of the police authorities. Two persons were convicted of having firearms illegally, and one Nova Scotia man was fined for illegal possession of ammunition, being an alien. ¶As the result of a picnic at Cleeves, Sask., held last July, 24 persons were recently convicted of being members of Jehovah's Witnesses, an illegal organization. Of these, nine had their convictions reversed on appeal this month. Judge A. E. Bence, in delivering judgment, expressed the opinion that evidence merely of belief in the teachings of the banned sect is insufficient for a conviction. In his opinion, there must be some evidence of the accused's activity in the banned organization before a conviction is warranted. ¶Dr. Samuel Levine, recently released from internment, has not been re-employed by the University of Toronto, on whose research staff he was engaged at the time of his arrest. According to Dr. Cody, president of the University, Dr. Levine's employment was of a temporary nature. "That work is now concluded, and to the best of my knowledge there is no opening on the university staff at the moment." ¶The Winnipeg and District Trades and Labor Council, meeting early in December, censured Premier M. F. Hepburn of Ontario for remarks attributed to him in New York concerning the outcome of the battle on the Russian front. The meeting suggested that men had been interned for less treacherous actions, and that if the D. of C. Regulations were to be equally applied to all, Mr. Hepburn's case deserved attention. ¶The National Council for Democratic Rights has adopted the policy of demanding the unconditional release from internment of all "anti-fascists." ¶The Windsor Star says that, whatever the hopes of the Government, the Franceschini case will not be forgotten by the Canadian people, and expresses the opinion that the time has come for the government to "clear up the case." The same might be said of the case of C. S. Jackson, interned for organizing strikes.

Suffer Little Children

"The list of children evacuated from England who have arrived in America today on their way to new homes here reads like a page of Debrett . . . " The Christian Century. July, 1940.

Expensively and beautifully dressed
Infant ambassador, be welcome here.
We like your poise and charming manner, dear,
And by your accent we are much impressed—
As we were meant to be. Come, little guest,
Offspring of England's bluest blooded peer,
Born to the best in life, who has no fear,
Not knowing want nor having been oppressed,
To you we open hearts and homes, aware
That elegant small fingers are more strong
Than forty million men to sow death there,
And shake a nation's reason, *Noblesse oblige*:
This little child may lead us, too, ere long
To work for Mars and make more refugees.

RITA ADAMS



JANUARY, 1942

Conscription---For What?

Fergus Glenn

THROUGH A CABINET SPOKESMAN, the Canadian government has announced that it is contemplating some form of compulsory selection of manpower and womanpower for war service within Canada, whether in the armed forces or in industry or agriculture.

As this is written, details of the scheme are lacking; but it seems clear that the government has at present no intention of conscripting men for armed service outside Canada. Whether or how far compulsion will be extended to "wealth," either in the form of individual private capital or corporate industry, is still uncertain. We have already had a considerable degree of compulsion through income and excess profits taxes, but few would contend that there has been any equality in the burdens imposed in this manner. The lending of money to the government through war bonds bearing comfortable interest is, for those in the higher income brackets or in a position to control large amounts of capital, a form of "sacrifice" almost entirely spurious.

What does appear certain is that there will be no relaxing of the drive for conscription of men to serve in our armed forces overseas. Indeed, in spite of the euphemistic terms used by the conscriptionists, such as "selective compulsory national service," "an all-out war effort," "total war" and the like, it is clear that what many of them have had principally in mind all along is the drafting of men into our armed services for extra-territorial fighting.

Leaving aside for the moment, however, the considerable number whose only gauge of Canada's effective contribution to the war effort would appear to be the number of men she has serving overseas, there are a great many people who are inclined to favor conscription for this purpose, even some who on most other matters would differ very widely from the conscriptionists. Perhaps the majority of these feel, rather vaguely, that since we are to have armed forces operating beyond our borders, the fairest way to raise them is by some compulsory selective system. Most of these people feel that such measures should be accompanied by similar compulsion applied to other resources besides manpower. Indeed, many of them would accept the idea of conscription of manpower on no other terms. Yet such people would not restrict, as the government still seems inclined to restrict, the selective compulsion to service within Canada.

They are puzzled by the conflict between the assertions, on the one hand of Mr. King that conscription for overseas service would be inimical to Canadian unity, and on the other hand of those who maintain that we cannot have a "total" war effort without it.

This article is an attempt to suggest certain questions honest and intelligent people must ask themselves before supporting the campaign for compulsory selection of our overseas fighting men.

Since the over-ruling consideration for many people is the theoretical "fairness" of conscription, it is necessary, in the first place, to consider carefully whether the selection of men for our overseas army according to some arbitrary standard of age, physical fitness and mental capacity, would actually achieve equality of treatment, a greater degree of "fairness" than we are likely to attain under the present voluntary system. To answer this question, we will have to envisage the boards of selection and review in operation. Would they be immune to the influence of wealth, position, occupation, in applying these fixed criteria of choice? Would they be immune to pressures from interested groups of employers? Would they, in short, be less amenable to ulterior considerations than ordinary human beings operating in any other capacity?

Some people might argue that the answers to these questions do not matter very much. They believe that in all probability there would be an *approximation* to equality of treatment. But whether or not this was a closer approximation to equality of treatment than the present system of voluntary choice, it would relieve the individual of the difficult obligation now incumbent upon him of making his own decision, of determining where he would be most useful in the common war effort. It would, of course, put an end to enlistment under pressure of economic circumstances alone, which was probably a factor in the early stages of the war. But, in a time of full employment, this factor has almost, if not quite, ceased to exist. Would taking it into consideration now do anything to wipe out the possible injustices of an earlier date?

We must still ask ourselves the question, however, whether this method would be likely to ensure the most *effective* choice of personnel. Would the compulsory assignment of large numbers of men to our overseas fighting forces who, though

qualified by age, physical condition and mental capacity for military service, were otherwise disinclined for such service and believed, rightly or wrongly, that they could be of greater use in some civilian branch of the war effort, be conducive to an army as high in efficiency and morale as an army consisting entirely of individuals who had chosen the role of a soldier in the active theatre of war of their own free will? The fact that men are being so selected in Great Britain and the United States does not necessarily affect the theory of the matter: other considerations—of population, necessities of the military situation, and so on—enter into the problem in these countries. We shall, however, have to examine carefully the claims that "the voluntary system in Canada has failed to produce the needed men," to see whether this is an actual fact, and how much the claim is conditioned by the zeal and intention of those who make it.

This leads directly to the most important question of all: What is the actual potentiality of Canada's at present "unassigned" manpower and womanpower, and in what way should it be applied if Canada's war effort is to attain its maximum usefulness?

To frame an intelligent answer to this question, we must take into consideration our geographical position and our orientation to the whole field of the war. Should our manpower henceforth be divided between further military effort in the overseas war zones and industrial and agricultural production? If so, in what proportion? Should it, on the contrary, be concentrated mainly, or even wholly, in the production of arms, equipment, munitions, ships, food—things upon which success in modern warfare is so vitally dependent? In considering this question, we shall have to remember that Canada has already raised, by voluntary methods, some 344,000 men, and has sent overseas and is maintaining there an army of some 125,000; that she will presumably send overseas in due course further troops sufficient to bring this army to a total of 230,000 men (the total enlisted for overseas service); that she has enrolled an air force personnel totalling about 90,000 men; that she has raised about 25,000 naval personnel, most of whom are now manning her naval vessels and available for service anywhere; that she has some 14,000 drafted "trainees" serving at home or completing their training; that she has a "reserve" army on part-time training of some 175,000. She has supplied a great deal, but not all, of the equipment needed by these armed forces overseas and in Canada. She is still engaged in recruiting and training air force personnel, and in training other Commonwealth airmen, providing the fixed equip-

ment and much of the moveable equipment for this vast scheme of air-training at a cost to herself of some \$600,000,000.

There will still be needed, from time to time, replacements to maintain our "active" armed forces at strength. Whether you believe this process should be continued on the voluntary basis or changed to the compulsory selective basis will probably depend partly upon your answers to the above questions regarding the relative "fairness" and efficiency of the two methods. But it is quite clear that many, perhaps most, of the current agitators for conscription have definitely in mind the enlargement of our overseas forces to proportions greatly in excess of those contemplated in present plans. The Canadian Legion, for instance, has set an objective of one million men for our overseas army alone.

More important, then, even than the *principle* of enforced military service overseas is the *intention* of those who have been most vociferous and insistent in the conscription drive, to the extent of endeavoring, like many of our large newspapers, to misrepresent the state of popular opinion on the matter throughout the dominion. This must be carefully considered in all its implications by thoughtful people, and given due weight in determining their own attitude.

What such people must ask themselves is: (1) Will the objective of this campaign (that is, a very much larger overseas army) be, in fact, brought nearer of attainment by the passing of a Conscription Act? (2) What effect, if this end is attained, will it have on manpower available for industrial and agricultural production? (3) Can we, in reality, continue to increase our output in these fields, and at the same time increase our overseas fighting forces? (4) If so, where is the manpower to come from?

Figures on Canada's manpower are still largely the result of rough estimates and calculations. We do know, however, that unemployment is practically non-existent; that the "unused" personnel is confined largely to youths arriving at employable age or status, and married women. These resources, though progressive, are limited. Physical and other disqualifications will reduce their effective total. It is doubtful to what extent married women (or single women, for that matter) could fill industrial positions and thus relieve men for heavier civilian or military duties. Extensive employment of married women in direct war work would entail drastic readjustments, such as arrangements for preparing and serving food and the care of children. Given the will, any such adjustments could be made. But we must still face

certain final limitations upon these resources of personnel.

On the other hand, we have about 3,000,000 engaged in industry of one kind or another, only about 600,000 of whom are producing articles and commodities for direct war purposes. Should we look in this direction for further personnel? Are the measures already taken or contemplated drastic enough to secure proper diversion of manpower from production of non-essential civilian goods to production of the things most needed for war? The fact is that since the war began, Canada has been carrying on "business as usual." There has been a drain on the national income by way of heavier taxes, subscriptions to war loans and savings certificates, and there has been a considerable expansion in our productive plant and machinery for war output, but there has been a very limited withdrawal of manpower and materials from non-essential industry for the purpose of expanding war industry. Most new and expanded plants have been manned from the ranks of the unemployed—sometimes at the expense of the farmer, who is greatly in need of help and is finding it almost impossible to get it, though he is engaged in the vital task of producing food for ourselves and our allies.

Entry of Japan and the United States into the war as belligerents, and declaration of war upon the United States by Germany and Italy, must certainly be considered in its possible effect on our "job" as an ally of the democratic powers. How do these events alter our position and obligations, if at all? We will certainly be less able to draw upon the United States for equipment and supplies than we have been; and so will Great Britain and Russia. In these circumstances, what is likely to be Great Britain's and Russia's greatest need from Canada—fighting manpower or fighting equipment? As a nation of some 12,000,000 people, what should we do to render the most effective help to these allies? What bearing has the defence of our coasts (now more important in the world-wide scope of the war) upon the whole question? Would it be better for us to concentrate what manpower is not required for home defence on production of equipment and food for our allies, now producing these things themselves under constant danger of bombing and invasion, than to give them the additional help in fighting manpower which, at best, would be relatively small?

If Canada's war effort is less effective than it should be, and we feel obligated to do something about it, what kind of agitation would be most likely to get to the heart of the matter, and obtain action of the kind calculated to make our con-

tribution really count for most in the long run?

It is impossible to avoid asking ourselves whether, in fact, the present concerted drive for conscription of men for overseas service is not a deliberate barking up the wrong tree. If we are not doing *all* that we should be doing in the way of expanding our industrial plant and devoting materials and manpower to the production of vitally necessary material, is it because of any resistance, active or passive, to so doing? In spite of our considerable expansion in this direction, it is unlikely that we have done all we could, if further planning, control of private industry and diversion of manpower were undertaken to this end. What is the reason? Is it possible that those in command of our industrial, financial and business machinery hesitate to face the risks to their own power, present and future, inherent in such a rapidly extended and planned "all-out" war production? May not part of the motivating impulse behind the concerted campaign for conscription of manpower for overseas service be due to the greater willingness of some of these people to draft men for military purposes than to be themselves drafted for war service of a different kind?

One other important question the honest seeker after a sound and intelligent position on this important matter must ask himself. Even from the standpoint of obtaining the needed replacements for our army, apart altogether from considerations of fairness and efficiency of personnel, would there be active or passive resistance to such measures amongst any large sections of our national community? Would any such step as "local option" amongst a part of our population with respect to conscription, while applying compulsory methods to other parts, be likely to further the final effectiveness of a conscription act? Or would it result in a kind of dissension which, in the long run, would militate against our total war effort? This question *must* be faced and weighed in the balance with all the other considerations regarding fairness, efficiency and "totality" which have been touched on above.

And finally, in arriving at a decision, we shall have to be quite frank with ourselves about the emotions that may underlie our reasoning. Are we being influenced by the desire to see Canada playing a spectacular military role in this great struggle, rather than the relatively unspectacular one of supplying mainly the "sinews of war"? Are we, by any chance, refusing to face the cold facts of the situation, and rejecting what these might show to be our paramount duty, in favor of a plan which would appease the sense we have that Canadians are not "suffering" like those whose

men are dying daily in battle—that we are “supplying the tools with which other people are finishing the job”? It will be necessary for some of us to be stern with ourselves on this point. For it is very easy to feel humiliated, when we see others being

mowed down by war, if our sons too are not in the front line in overwhelming numbers. It is hard, sometimes, to forego what seems a heroic role for one that may, in the long run, be more useful in turning the tide of victory.

Canada Calling

George Hambleton

IN LONDON, A FEW YEARS AGO, the prime minister invited Canadian correspondents to a round-table talk. Among Mr. Mackenzie King's cabinet colleagues present were Mr. Dunning, then minister of finance, and, if memory serves correctly, Mr. Crerar and the late Mr. Lapointe. During some rather desultory conversation, Mr. Dunning suddenly asked each correspondent present if he had any information of the weather in western Canada. None had the faintest idea whether it was wet or fine. “May I point out to you, Mr. Prime Minister,” remarked Mr. Dunning, not without a touch of testiness, “that here you have a number of Canadian correspondents and not one has any idea of weather conditions in the west.”

Odd as Mr. Dunning's question may appear at this lapse of time, the information he sought was of prime importance to him as minister of finance. For it was a drought year and what Mr. Dunning really wanted to know was whether long-delayed rain had fallen and ensured a good wheat crop or whether continued rainless days would bring more penury to the west.

But the question was also important as revealing two things:

It revealed the paucity of information about Canada available even in London.

It revealed how little is known, even in the highest Canadian circles, of how news of Canada is sent abroad, who selects it and who is responsible for its transmission.

In his extremely interesting and valuable study, “Canada Gets The News,” Mr. Carlton McNaught admirably describes how foreign news is gathered and presented for Canadian consumers. But Mr. McNaught's study does not deal, nor does it purport to deal, with the no less important question, how Canada sends the news.

As one who, for a number of years, had an intimate connection with the largest of the Canadian news agencies—for ten of those years as chief correspondent in Europe—perhaps I may be able to remove a few misconceptions.

In the first place, let it be made clear that Canadian news agencies (contrary to some popular ideas) do not collect news in Canada and themselves send it to individual newspapers all over the world. They never have done so. Some individual paper through its own correspondent, or through some special arrangement with an agency, may obtain a special service. But taken by and large, Canadian agencies supply other or affiliated agencies which, in the last resort, are responsible for the editing and selection of Canadian news transmitted in the territories they cover. And these other agencies are owned and controlled outside Canada. This is a disturbing fact, yet it is virtually inevitable unless Canadian agencies are prepared at enormous cost to establish world-wide distribution systems of their own.

Chief news agencies operating in Canada are: The Canadian Press, The British United Press, Reuter's.

The first two are Canadian corporations. Reuter's is British. Until the German occupation of Paris the French agency, Havas, maintained a correspondent in Ottawa and had close arrangements with The Canadian Press to which it supplied a service. Havas has now no connections with The Canadian Press.

What happens to a story originating in Canada and transmitted abroad? Suppose, for instance, one of the Dionne quintuplets contracts a dangerous cold. How does that tremendous fact reach the news-hungry multitudes of a war-torn world? If it is picked up first by some local reporter, The Canadian Press will get it through its member paper. Now, except for a limited service to Newfoundland and the British West Indies, The Canadian Press does not supply individual papers outside Canada. It exchanges with The Associated Press of the United States. So our little Dionne item—which may be featured or not according to pressure of war news—goes to New York where The Associated Press takes it in hand, distributes it over its own services as it deems fit and makes it available to other agencies with which it has

exchange arrangements.

Lest this recall juvenile memories of the House that Jack Built, may I interject that the last item I read on the Dionne quintuplets was sent out from Berlin by the official German agency and printed in Portuguese in a Brazilian paper published in Rio de Janeiro. D.N.B.—the Germany agency—cited a New York despatch as its authority.

Now take The British United Press. In recent years, the B.U.P. has gained considerable ground in Canada. The B.U.P. links up with The United Press of the United States, which, much as the A.P. does with the C.P., supplies its clients in the United States and South America. The B.U.P. also has its own clients in various parts of the world to which it supplies special services. It has links in all the dominions. Both through its affiliations with The United Press and through other connections, the B.U.P. is travelling far afield.

Of all news agencies, Reuter's is the most widely known. It was first in the field and deservedly won a world-wide reputation. In recent years, heavy competition from American agencies and a tendency to live on past laurels have dimmed the lustre. Reuter's—as the British minister of information recently admitted at Westminster—has lost ground. For some years, Reuter's was subsidized by the Canadian government to increase its service of Canadian news to Great Britain. During the subsidy period, Reuter's maintained a bureau at Ottawa. But since the subsidy was permitted to lapse, Reuter's service from Canada has diminished considerably. Its Ottawa correspondent, instead of filing direct to London, now routes his messages via Reuter's in New York.

Significant in the general set-up is that despite urgent need for complete understanding of what other units of the British Commonwealth are doing in the war, no Canadian agency has yet been able to arrange for interchange of news with any other dominion. Exchange arrangements are with American agencies. A few years ago, Mr. J. F. B. Livesay, at the time general manager of The Canadian Press, endeavored to establish a British Empire News Service. The basis of it was news exchange between The Canadian Press and news agencies in Great Britain and the dominions. The scheme was discussed at various Empire Press Union conferences but never became effective. The net result is that The Canadian Press has now no direct interchange with any dominion news agency. It does not itself send its news to Great Britain. It does not transmit news to any part of the British Empire, with the exception of Newfoundland and the British West Indies.

That was why Mr. Dunning could not secure the information he sought about rains in the Canadian west and perforce had to lament what must have seemed to him the abyssmal ignorance of The Canadian Press correspondent present at the prime minister's press conference in London.

Dissemination of Canadian news abroad is admittedly bad. How is it to be improved? There we run into the difficulty not only of transmission, but of distribution in the country overseas. If one is prepared to pay for the cables, it is a fairly simple matter, for instance, to transmit a service of Canadian news from Vancouver to Sydney, New South Wales. But what is to happen to the cable when it arrives in Australia? There, if it is to serve any useful purpose, it must be telegraphed across an island continent and re-transmitted to every paper served. This means that the papers receiving it must either be prepared to pay for it (unless government subsidies meet the cost) or they must be prepared to carry the messages over their own leased wires and give a return service of news in lieu of payment in cash.

The Australian government has recently sought to meet this problem of distribution, so far as the United States and Canada are concerned, by opening an Australian News and Information Bureau in New York. The bureau, which was established in March, 1941, secures news items about Australia from the Australian Associated Press and copies official shortwave broadcasts from Australia. These are then issued in the form of brief, admirably prepared newspaper stories, and distributed among newspapers in the United States and Canada.

Items from the Australian Bureau, in hand as I write, outline the policies of the Australian Labor government. They tell how Canada has asked the Australian government for permission to mass-produce the newly developed Owen sub-machine gun. They pay tribute to the "rugged" American tanks supplied to empire armies in Libya and they tell how the main body of Australians was withdrawn by night from Tobruk. All these items are newsy, readable and to the point.

What Canada is thinking and doing needs to be told not only in Great Britain and throughout the British Commonwealth but in all the twenty republics of central and South America, and that without the necessity of preliminary editing in the United States. A short-wave station for the CBC would help considerably and might be utilized as the Australian Information Bureau in New York is utilizing the Australian short-wave as the basis of its North American service. Moreover, a short-wave can transmit music, drama, reflexes

of that humanity which lies beyond the dry bones of press agency news. But short-wave has its limitations. The newspaper and the periodical have still to be reached, and they can be reached most effectively with news and information presented attractively and with a human touch. To my mind, the market for propaganda is passing. Propaganda based on half-truths in the long run creates distrust and negatives itself. But a newspaper must have news. News, real news, attractive news, is its life-blood and the reason for its being.

And the problem for Canada is how to get the news there—news bright enough to be featured, news that will not only be printed but will also be read.

It may be that the problem will have to be considered as part of a wider problem affecting the British Commonwealth as a whole. But considered it must be if Canada is to be known and understood abroad.

The People Versus the Masses

Frank H. Underhill

THE MOST DEPRESSING FEATURE of the war so far, and the thing which does most to make one feel defeatist, is not the battle news from across the Atlantic but the mass of stuff poured out by our editors, columnists, professors and best people generally on the subject of democracy and liberty. When one is in the habit of reading fairly widely in current periodicals and books, and when one has submitted himself for some time to a tasteless diet of all this rehashed rhetoric of the nineteenth century, he gets the feeling that V stands for Vacuity. To come across an author who is thinking and writing freshly has the same invigorating effect as a supply of vitamins from fresh fruits and vegetables must have had upon the early sailors when they were suffering acutely from scurvy.

The book about democracy which we have long needed is now here. Mr. J. B. Priestley's *Out of the People** is the real thing. Mr. Priestley can justly claim that he is a genuine democrat and liberal, for he has been willing to get himself into trouble with his own authorities for expressing his views, and the views he expressed were his sympathies with and faith in the common people. Most important of all, he is not a late convert.

*Out of the People: J. B. Priestley; Toronto, Macmillan; pp. 160; \$2.00.

He was expressing these views before the bombs began to fall on London. Most Canadians with radio sets know that the very sound of his voice, on the rare occasions on which the BBC and the CBC allow us to hear it nowadays, has an invigorating effect. And this book, because it contains the quintessence of the conclusions he has reached from his study of Britain at war, is even better than Priestley on the air.

"Everything comes out of the people, everyday people, the people as you find them and leave them; people, people, just people!" Mr. Priestley believes that the vision Walt Whitman had of his American people is coming true today among the English people. It was the people themselves who proved that Hitler cannot bomb England into submission. Under the strain and agony of the war they have suddenly been awakened out of the dull despairing apathy of the 1920's and 1930's and are once again showing their capacity to take charge of things, to throw up their own leaders. "Official Britain has done more or less what was expected of it; a little better here, a little worse there. But unofficial Britain has staggered the world . . . These people have proved that our society can be redeemed from apathy, cynicism and despair." And he goes on to express his belief that the people are less reluctant to change the pre-war social and economic structure than the government is.

Who are the people? Mr. Priestley explains what he means by setting his conception against two other conceptions of society. One is that of English conservatives, who see England divided into classes, who think as members of a class and bar themselves out from the people, and who are waiting for a return of the pleasant pre-war (i.e., pre-1914-war) days with the huntin' an' shootin' an' fishin'. (I'm quoting Priestley.) Many of them are still more concerned with the rights and privileges of their own class than with the extent of the war effort as a whole. But these class divisions are being blasted away. Today, he says, you read about last night's bomb raid that "seven people were killed and between twenty and thirty injured." You do not read that one upper-class person was killed and three injured, two members of the middle class were killed and eight injured, and the rest of the killed and injured belonged to the working class. But even before the bombings England was being changed into a society more sinister in character than the stuffy, snobbish class society of which most people had a picture in their minds.

The second conception against which Mr. Priestley sets his own conception of the people is that of the masses. A new society all over the western

world has been coming into existence in the last generation, a society sharply divided into masters and masses. And the division in our day which cuts most deeply, says Mr. Priestley, is not that between socialism and capitalism, or between fascism and communism, or between democracy and totalitarianism, but between those who think in terms of people and those who think in terms of masses. "When I say to myself 'the people,' I have a confused but lively vision of a hundred faces and a hundred voices, as if a picture by old Breughel had suddenly come to life. In short, I think of persons. But when I say to myself 'the masses,' I see at once a grey featureless horde, and hear nothing but a muttering and murmuring. I do not think of persons. The masses are not real human beings. They have been de-humanized . . . Hitler, the vindictive doss-house dreamer, thinks and acts always in terms of the masses, and never for a moment in terms of the people. He is essentially a manipulator of the masses . . . The people always have roots, whereas the masses are rootless; moving almost like sleep-walkers, everywhere, anywhere, in and out of their giant factories or mechanical places of amusement . . . You cannot fall in love with, marry, or give birth to one of the masses. You can employ or drill the masses; you can help to feed and entertain them . . . but you cannot ever really know or love the masses, otherwise they would stop being masses and turn into people." And he adds quite correctly that what makes the ordinary democrat suspicious of communism is that so many of the communists he knows share this habit of Hitler's of thinking of masses instead of people.

The phenomenon of the masses as we see it in Nazi Germany is so sinister because Germany only reveals the ultimate stage of certain tendencies in our contemporary world which can be detected in all countries. Mr. Priestley enumerates three main causes which have tended in modern society to depress people into masses. One is the decay of religious belief. This is dangerous for democracy because it makes individual men and women seem less significant to themselves as well as to others. A second is the organization of authority in the modern world. Military and police power, assisted by all the engines of state-controlled propaganda, leave the great body of citizens helpless against their government in a way in which they have not been helpless for centuries. The third influence, and the most important, is the development of large-scale industry. This has produced a sharp division between a few persons who are masters of the machine and the crowds of folk who are servants of the machine. Mere socialism does not

close this gulf, for whether the state or private industry runs the machine, it is the machine itself which makes the division into masters and masses. In all industrialized countries "big business, mass production, slick large-scale advertising and showmanship, newspapers that lull and stupefy," all these are pervading influences which produce the masses.

In England Mr. Priestley thinks that there is more hope for democracy than in most other parts of the world. (Does he refer to America?) For one thing, the Englishman while more and more divorced from formal religion, has still retained that deep sense of a moral order which has to be stifled early in life if you are to turn into a satisfactory and satisfied Nazi. For another thing, England abounds beyond other communities in voluntary associations of all kinds which give her people an opportunity for positive activity in some field. "A vital democracy is a community of real people working out its own salvation." Mr. Priestley is somewhat afraid that a plunge into collectivism, without a change of atmosphere and values, might soon bring about a complete masters-and-masses system. So he stresses that "it is far more important to achieve a social system that offers a maximum opportunity for creation than to produce a smoothly running social machine that distributes benefits to a passive-minded uncreative mob."

The conception which he thinks is to transform his country is that of England not as a sum total of properties, nor as a gigantic joint stock company, nor as another territory where masses exist, but as the home of the British people. If people think of their country in this way they will be as active and assertive as they are in their own homes. Politics will become more like village cricket, where there are more people on the field than about it, and less like professional football where the people are turned into mere cup-final spectators.

The book ends with an appendix in which the author sketches the kind of particular reforms which he thinks are needed. But he has no use for blueprints, and his sketch is very sketchy. It includes a national wages policy, giving equal wages for equal work, state ownership of all land, a basic minimum standard of food, housing, clothing, health and education, and a good many other things that would shock most right thinking Canadians. But Mr. Priestley is not so much interested in particular programs as in changing the attitude of people towards their government. He wants them to be taking part in the village cricket match. And the weakness of his whole thinking is summed up in that simile. The complex

large-scale communal affairs of a nation of 45 million people cannot be compared to a village cricket match. That is why they have tended to become like a professional football game with the masses only looking on. Mr. Priestley thinks a new democratic party might emerge from a nationwide network of discussion groups. He is just a little bit naive about politics and inclined to think that professional politicians could be eliminated as unnecessary. But a direct democracy with 30 million people on the voters' list is physically impossible. It is large-scale politics as well as large-scale business and industry which has tended to turn people into masses in the great society. Mr. Priestley doesn't quite seem to see this, or doesn't like to admit it because of his distaste for politicians.

Still he has written a grand book. "The official view of this war still remains confused, negative, uninspiring. We must fight for a positive purpose. Even if we are fighting for survival, we have the right to ask 'Survival as what?'" His 160 pages contain the best answer to that question that has yet appeared.

Elegy in a Suburban Churchyard

AVAILABLE for retired persons, choice lots in select residential low-tax area for immediate and permanent occupancy. Beautiful landscaped grounds. Complete privacy. *Classified.*

This village where the dead resort
To holiday at ease,
Has odd attraction for the quick
Too early yet, by years,
To jog a journey through the yews
With sober friends behind,
And floral wreaths to speed them well,
And not a care in mind.

The world that ended for the souls
Who nudge the crowded dust,
Goes moodily about its chores
With shall and will and must;
No thunderstone or ague fit
Brings license to retire
The body from its enterprise
On softly-carried bier.

Sing hey! the township on the hill
Where smirking skulls restrict
New tenants to a ghoul's who's who
And life is interdict;
Sing ho! the realtor's paradise,
Where lots of puny size
(With muniments, attested, sealed)
Are fabulously priced!

LEO KENNEDY

O Canada

When the war is over and Government purchasing disappears, it is essential that Government controls and regulations be removed with all possible speed, accompanied by the fullest amelioration in taxation that is allowable, for, if we are to continue in a system of free enterprise for which we are fighting, it is to private initiative that we must look for resumption of normal activities. Nothing can stifle individual effort more effectively than excessive regulation and high taxation and no one can undertake new ventures unless permitted to retain the profit which arises from successful effort. (Montreal Gazette, Dec. 2nd. Bank of Montreal Report, President's Address).

"Such disunity and confusion as we have here today may be compared to the situation in France before the fall, . . . 'The French republic—the greatest republic the world has ever seen—perished through just such a situation as we have in B. C. today."

(G. G. McGeer, K.C., Vancouver M.P., as reported in The Vancouver Daily Province, Nov. 26.)

Nephew of Churchill is missing after operations with R.C.A.F. Eloped with Unity Freeman Mitford's sister; enlisted here despite leftist leanings in youth.

(Montreal Gazette, Dec. 4.)

BENNETT SAMPLES LIFE OF WORKERS

LONDON, Nov. 25—(C.P. Cable)—Viscount Bennett recently lived overnight the lives of factory workers occupying a North Midlands war workers' hostel, it was disclosed last night.

(Montreal Star, Nov. 26)

R. T. Elson reports from Washington the coining of a crude jingle by U.S. newspapermen following our Prime Minister's latest visit to Hyde Park: "William Lyon Mackenzie King never said a (censored) thing."

(E. Philpott in the Victoria Daily Times, Nov. 7)

This month's prize of a six months' subscription goes to F. R. Scott, Montreal, Que. All contributions should contain original clipping, date and name of publication from which taken.



BOOKS OF THE MONTH

Starting Point of our Troubles

A GENERATION OF MATERIALISM 1871-1900: Carlton J. H. Hayes; Toronto, Musson; pp. 390; \$5.00.

THIS VOLUME is the most recent to appear in the Harper series of histories entitled "The Rise of Modern Europe." The series itself is a notable one as being a reinterpretation of European history by American scholars which is marked by its emphasis upon intellectual and cultural movements and upon the development of social and economic institutions rather than upon the doings of politicians and diplomats. Professor Carlton Hayes is the inspirer of a school of history at Columbia which has made a great name for itself in recent years through its contributions to the study of nationalism in our modern civilization. And he has here produced the most notable volume of a notable series.

Diplomatic history, the manoeuvres of power politics, the topics which we usually expect when we pick up a volume on modern Europe, all this is compressed into one chapter at the beginning and another at the end of the book. The other chapters are devoted to analysing the complex interaction of ideas and material forces in which the progress of four centuries of "Enlightenment" in the western world culminated and crashed. The book closes, of course, before the crash finally arrives, and Professor Hayes barely refers to the catastrophes of our day in his pages. But the grim irony which pervades every page of the book is more moving than many paragraphs of moralizing.

After 1870 the fresh and optimistic liberalism which had been the distinguishing feature of the nineteenth century went sour. Professor Hayes begins by showing how what he calls the "ecumenical" liberalism of the earlier period narrowed itself into the "sectarian" Liberalism (with a capital L) of urban bourgeois political parties. He goes on to a brilliant analysis of the mechanizing of work and thought as expressed in business and industry on one side and in deterministic science on the other; of the warfare between science and theology, and its effects upon religion and the arts; of the emergence of the masses and its results in trade unionism, popular education and journalism, and Marxian socialism; of the resurgence of economic nationalism—collectivization at home and aggressive imperialism abroad; and of the rise of totalitarian racial nationalism. And then, having shown how the dominant urges of the time were heading Europe towards the disasters of the twentieth century, he ends with an account of the curious political event which brought the nineteenth century to a close, the international peace conference at the Hague in 1899.

"This volume as it is," he tells us in the preface, "I could hardly have written before now. Born and prepared for college in the age which it attempts to recall, I saw those last three decades of the nineteenth century then—and for almost thirty years afterwards—as a stage, indeed a glorious stage, in the progress of Europe and our western civilization toward ever greater liberty, democracy, social betterment and scientific control of nature. I still see those decades thus, but I also now see them, even more clearly, as a fertile seedtime for the present

and quite different harvest of personal dictatorship, social degradation, and mechanized destruction. It is, in my opinion, this dual character of the age—at once climax of enlightenment and source of disillusionment—which gives it peculiar interest and pregnant significance."

It is difficult to praise this volume too highly. One has a feeling that Leo XIII with his neo-Thomism emerges a little too clearly as the real hero of the period, that the author is a little too anxious to prove that Marxism was not really a mass movement and to find other explanations of modern imperialism than the obvious economic ones. But this is no doubt due to prejudices of the reviewer who was also born in that generation of materialism.

So far as I can recollect there is only one reference to Canada in the whole book. That is to the Gothic parliament buildings at Ottawa which were built in the period. The Dominion of Canada grew up to manhood in this era, and the influence of the generation of materialism shows itself in every aspect of Canadian history. But we Canadians are the sleep-walkers of the modern age. We are still talking of restoring the early nineteenth-century world of democratic liberalism.

FRANK H. UNDERHILL

Organizing the Movies

STARS AND STRIKES: UNIONIZATION OF HOLLYWOOD: Murray Ross; Columbia University Press; pp. 233; \$3.50.

"THE SCREEN Office Employees' Guild is now trying to negotiate a contract with the rest of the industry which will standardize wages and benefits on uniformly high levels. This contract will mark the completion of Hollywood's unionization."

Startling, but true, is that statement, which concludes the main part of this unique study by Murray Ross of Brooklyn College. Twenty-five years it has taken to complete the job, since Samuel Gompers guided an A.F. of L. organization campaign, which didn't get far but set the wheels a-rolling. But it's only eight years since a group of actors including Alan Mowbray, Boris Karloff and Ralph Morgan met and founded the Screen Actors' Guild, which became the keystone of white-collar unionism in the great film field. The story of the fight put up by the world's highest-paid employees to improve the miserable conditions in which their less fortunate fellow workers wallowed is a tacit rebuke to those smug, timid or cloistered professional workers with plenty to gain for themselves as well as others, yet who just can't be stirred from their flabby "individualism" into action to protect themselves from the exploitation that keeps them poor and helpless and interferes with their usefulness to the community.

Most interesting of all, perhaps, to trade unionists, is the picture of the most craftily conceived and skilfully handled of all company unions, the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, which survived attack after attack by now and then actually doing something a trade union ought to do. Fought persistently by the real trade unionists, who saw that its basic domination by the bosses must inevitably render it, no matter what its occasional

achievements, a Trojan horse, the Academy was the refuge of such "apostles of appeasement" as Conrad Nagel, who believed in sweet harmony at all costs. Again and again the producers showed that they knew how to manipulate this love of harmony to their own ends, until in the end the aroused workers threw the Academy overboard and insisted on recognition of the genuine trade unions, the Hollywood Guilds.

This is an admirable book, filling a real need. The field has never been more than very partially covered before, in such books as Cedric Belfrage's "Promised Land." This reviewer, who found its facts on the whole absolutely accurate, after following the events in the trade paper *Variety* (the book is, in fact, remarkably thoroughly documented), would offer only two main criticisms. The author doesn't seem to have thought of the likelihood that the Bioff-Browne racket combination, which the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees ousted just before the two were convicted of extortion and heavily sentenced, might have been welcomed by the wily producers as a comparatively cheap way of stalling off the demands of genuine union leaders. Carey McWilliams' recent article in the *New Republic* offers factual proof that this was the case, and that the extortion which the film moguls silently "suffered" for so long was actually self-induced.

The other criticism is that, had the author included a selection of the many colorful tales that must be extant, sidelights on the struggle between the producers and the stars, his book might well have enjoyed a wide sale to the general public, at the same time giving that public a good easy lesson in trade-unionism. As it is, in spite of the catchy title, it will probably be read only by those with at least a slight preliminary interest in union organization. It's boiled down so much that most of the spice is out for the average reader. For the reader with a bit of a basis there's a good deal of spice, but this one would have preferred the rest of it too.

FRANK FRASER

Farm Organization

LAND AND LABOR: George V. Haythorne, Leonard C. Marsh; Oxford (McGill Univ.—Social Research Studies); pp. 568; \$4.00.

LAND AND LABOR by George V. Haythorne, secretary of the Nova Scotia Economics Council, and Leonard C. Marsh, director of Social Research, McGill University, is the eleventh in the McGill Social Research series. This series is concerned with the main economic and social aspects of the problem of employment stabilization, and attempts to make a special study of aspects which have not received sufficient emphasis in other studies.

The present volume deals especially with the social setting of agriculture in the central provinces, with the farm labor market, with the relation of agriculture to the total economy of Canada, and the need for constructive efforts to strengthen rural life. Special emphasis is laid on that member of the rural population known as the wage laborer. The differences in expenditure of farmers on wage labor in the various counties and regions of Ontario and Quebec are given in charts, as is also the seasonal variation in the number of farm jobs. The relation of "capital" and "labor" on the farm is analyzed. Self-sufficient versus commercialized agriculture is discussed, attitudes and social institutions, and the need for farm organization.

The outlook for Canadian agriculture is summed up in

a plea for a balanced agriculture. The proper recognition of the need for redressing major inequalities of welfare and opportunity within the community is necessary if Canada is to have any kind of national solidarity. The authors are convinced that greater unity of organization among farmers is one of the requisites and that education in all its forms is a necessity.

This is a very timely book because the present situation of Canadian agriculture is critical. The recently formed Canadian Federation of Agriculture is an attempt to deal with the situation and this book supplies much valuable and necessary material. No available source of information or statistics on the social aspects of agriculture has been left untapped by the authors. The complete list of charts, tables and maps included in this survey will make it a handbook for all those working in the field of rural adult education and farm organization.

A second volume focussing attention on the prairie provinces is to follow in this series.

D. C. S.

Von Papen

SATAN IN TOP HAT: Tibor Koeves; Longmans, Green & Co. (Alliance); pp. 359; \$4.00.

HERE ARE FEW FIGURES superficially more fascinating in the underworld of diplomacy than that of Franz von Papen. That of course is the reason for this biography of him, with its moving picture title, appearing at the present time. Its journalist author does not intend it to be a full length study of the man, but rather a melodramatic "political biography," divided into "four acts," covering von Papen's activities in America during the last war, in Germany during the downfall of the republic and the rise of Nazidom, in Austria during the coming of the Anschluss, and in Turkey from April 1939 until the spring of 1941.

"In order to make his book more readable, the author has taken the liberty of slightly dramatizing parts of his material"—and in order to write a whole book about what he knew and observed of Nazi diplomatic methods during the annexation of Austria (and he would seem to have known and observed a lot), the author tied it to the figure of the mouthpiece on the spot, Herr von Papen. The tie-up would seem to be an uneasy one, for the author's knowledge of his villain's activities in America and later in Germany, is fragmentary, and the first two acts fail to carry conviction.

In the fourth act we are led to believe that the German-Russian pact of 1939 was the result of Papen's machinations with the U.S.S.R.'s ambassador to Turkey, during the summer of that year, while they both went fishing in the Black Sea. It may be so; anything may be so in the Nazi arena where sober truth looks like melodrama, but it would be interesting to have further corroboration.

That in short is the book's weakness. Vivid and well written throughout, only the latter half is sufficiently plausible to sustain interest and even that suffers from the limitations of the melodramatic method. The characters must conform to the plot and the plot in this case, for the most part, is history. It is the dramatist's duty to supply dialogue which will plausibly account for the action and to this end the author has to pad out available information with a liberal use of the psychological method of rationalizing after the event, resulting in those invented conversations which, no matter how shrewd the guesser, so seldom succeed in carrying the reader with them.

As a result this book, insofar as it sets out to present

Papen as a diplomatic devil succeeds only in showing him up as a political pawn, and insofar as it attempts to present a picture of Nazi diplomatic methods it strays too far from the author's field of information.

G. C. ANDREW

Art in the Nineteenth Century

THE STORY OF MODERN ART: By Sheldon Cheney. Macmillan.

THIS BOOK is an attempt to explain the last century of art to people who are still struggling with such canons of appreciation as "likeness to nature, literary cleverness, and smoothness of finish." On the whole, it is about as successful an attempt as any I have seen, and it will certainly supersede a great number of other books in its field, including a few of Mr. Cheney's own. It is better illustrated than most other low-price books on the subject, it is both catholic and readable, it sustains an admirable balance between anecdote, contemporary setting and technical criticism, and it makes the artists it deals with credibly human.

Keeping his audience in mind, Mr. Cheney begins away back with the French Revolution and the pseudo-classical dictatorship of David. The fact of central importance in art since then he regards as the development of non-representational elements in design as a protest against a crude and unimaginative theory of imitation. Pure impressionism, as practised for instance by Monet, is thus to some extent "an interruption of the development of modernism," and the first-rate impressionists outgrew their own theory. This would imply that the book was concerned largely with French art and that it would spiritually conclude with the expressionist and post-impressionist movements of the early decades of this century.

To some extent this may be true, but the amount of space Mr. Cheney gives to German, American and Mexican art helps to make his book unusually interesting. Too many books on modern art have stuck to Paris: Parisian art has been oversold and overadvertised; the inflated prices it commands are a dealer's racket; third-rate Parisians are better known to the world than first-rate painters of other countries. It is not the fall of France that has made this state of things obsolete, but the fact that the Parisian tradition of decorative art for a luxury trade cannot meet changed world conditions. The tendency in America, and in Germany before Hitler, is toward the integration of painting and sculpture with ordinary living, coöoperating with architecture and with technical and commercial design, with its eye ultimately on centralized social planning.

Mr. Cheney's broad and sane perspective does something to make this clear. The American Whistler, for instance, who insisted on redesigning entire rooms to form a background for his painting, takes on a new importance in his book. But as he is tracing out primarily a decorative tradition his treatment of artists pre-occupied with the social function of their art is bound to be somewhat perfunctory. He is also very chilly toward the English, and it is high time Canadian reviewers began to complain about the omission of all reference to Canada and in all books on modern art.

Books in this field, particularly American ones, are apt to be riddled with a vaguely arty jargon which is the product of confused thinking and bad writing. Mr. Cheney on the whole escapes this charge, though it may be suggested that the few bits of jargon which have been allowed to remain (as when he says that Goya "definitely

orchestrates the several plastic means") will only confirm the plain reader he is trying to reach in his prejudices. But the book is one of the best of its kind and I highly recommend it for general use.

HELEN FRYE.

German Thought Between Wars

WAR AND THE GERMAN MIND: William K. Pfeiler; Columbia University Press 1941; pp. 349; \$3.25, (U.S.)

PROFESSOR PFEILER'S TITLE is provocative and perhaps misleading. He does not posit a "German Mind" in any historical sense and is well aware of the dangers of reducing a complexity of diverse factors to a national simplicity. He suggests that certain salient characteristics are to be found which differentiate the German from his neighbors, the tendency of the German mind to function in the intellectual field and the field of volition at one and the same time, the acceptance of subordination and the importance of fidelity and loyalty, and a receptivity to contributions from other cultures as a result of the central geographical position of a country without natural defensive boundaries. The economic chaos of Germany in the post-war period, her spiritual confusion and sense of humiliation and defeat heightened the acute awareness of the war experience and led to a peculiarly emphatic and poignant expression of individual reactions, through the medium of fiction, although diaries and letters reveal the interest in the underlying significance of war as an experience even during the conflict.

A systematic analysis of this literature reveals two main attitudes, the one ego-centric, critical, intellectual embittered, stresses the horror, waste and futility of war; the other ethno-centric, is aware of the comradeship between soldier and soldier, soldier and officer, even soldier and enemy, until war, in spite of its horrors, is regarded as the supreme experience, a baptism of fire which regenerates the individual and purges the nation of greed and selfishness, preparing the way for a new greatness.

The peak of the output of ego-centric pacifist literature was reached in 1929; during the early post-war years there was a strong desire to forget the war and literary tendencies were towards individualistic emotionalising and psychoanalytical treatment of historical and social problems and a new factualism. In 1927 the heirs of Barbusse, Unruh and Latzko released a flood of novels which caused the term "war-novel" to be associated with a disillusioned, anti-war attitude; at least one of these, Remarque's *ALL QUIET ON THE WESTERN FRONT* created a sensation in a world which fondly hoped that the signing of the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact heralded a new era. But it became almost immediately apparent that the impossible task that the leaders of the Weimar Republic had tackled courageously became increasingly difficult as economic chaos threatened to engulf the world and the individualist intellectual tradition faced a spiritual bankruptcy.

Even during the actual conflict the ethno-centric viewpoint had found expression in literary form and in the early thirties it became the dominating theme of the war novel. After 1933 no other point of view could find expression within Germany. Professor Pfeiler suggests that many of the ideas and even of the slogans of National Socialism were ready to hand in the war novel written by people in whom national consciousness was particularly acute; in the appendix he gives a summary of trends of criticism of the war novels but beyond this does not attempt to evaluate the response of the reading public to them or the acceptance of the changing emphasis, but he

sees the war literature as a preliminary "softening-up" agent and the war experience as a powerful force which could be used by the leaders to unify and solidify the nation in its ethno-centric culture.

M. W.

Splenlove Earthbound

SPENLOVE IN ARCADY: William McFee; Macmillan; pp. 467; \$3.00.

McFEE'S *Splenlove in Arcady* affirms the truth that all good things must come to an end. It has much of the charm of earlier novels of McFee, and will be read eagerly, as it deserves, by the clearly defined McFee public but it will not win him new friends on the same scale.

Spenlove retires from the sea, is "put on the shelf" as he says. The process of retirement brings much interesting reflection, some adventure, and a honeymoon. The incidents cover various unpleasant aspects of literary life in the United States, recollections of the same in England—also unpleasant.

In the texture of this novel they indicate that McFee is ashore and readers will recognize in the story of the mad poet the death by suicide a year or two ago of an ultra-modernistic versifier. A secondary character is Elliott Ducroy, a writer of thrillers: his experience in Hollywood and his seduction by Sydney Saxon. After liaison with Sydney he dies in time's nick and Spenlove picks up his relict, Perdita, her teen-age daughter, and heads for a honeymoon.

Something funny always happens when an Englishman who is also a novelist discovers biology. And so with McFee's discovery of sex. If you are closely in touch with the book trade you'll realize that he has read Dr. Alexis Carrell's *Man the Unknown* and been impressed by that scientist's statement that in the modern scene prophylaxis has been substituted for morals. That is how McFee, at least, tries to explain the promiscuous grappling and grunting that he finds in the American scene. His report may not necessarily be any more accurate than his effort to reproduce American idiom—something no English novelist has ever come close to.

McFee's earlier books were free of the English preoccupation with food and drink. One of the few bits of literary exegesis that this reviewer is guilty of is that Dickens sold because he wrote about food for the most pre-eminently hungry race in the world. This book returns to those pre-historic levels, with emphasis on beer and cheese and roast beef—with pickles. It reminds one of the accepted thing in English novels; Phyllis Bottome, for instance, one of whose heroines wondered whether the fellow loved her because, on the way home from a picnic lunch in the country (with a hamper of food) he passed two tea places without stopping.

Spenlove in Arcady is frightfully British in texture. As you turn the pages you expect, momentarily, to find a female sitting in the rain on a clay-mud bank beside a hero clad in Norfolk jacket, smoking a pipe, being gruff and remote (lunch being ended) and mid the drooping rain thrilling quietly to herself as the odor of the jacket, mingled with rain and pipe smoke and sweat drifts past her, and exclaiming to the hero, "My . . . how masculine you are!" At which point the hero puts her into the pint sized puddle jumper and heads for the nearest bun, macaroon and tea shop. This latest volume by McFee nearly works out that way. Spenlove, after all, is bearded. And Perdita, besides being alcoholic, is English, and each thinks the other will be a good influence.

ROBIN TEALEY

USSR at Work

RED PLANES FLY EAST: Piotr Pavlenko; London; The Labor Book Service; pp. 523; 75c + postage (LBS member rate).

IF THE ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION of the Far Eastern U.S.S.R. has only recently been begun, even less has this far corner of the world been exploited in the literary sense. In spite of maps in magazines like *Fortune*, which mark in variegated hues the railways, industrial centres, oil fields and so on, we in this country are apt to think of the Russia between the Urals and Vladivostok as a vast uninhabited wasteland. This novel puts life where, on maps, there is only a thin black line meaning railway; and human beings where on maps are geometrical figures—squares, circles, triangles.

The theme of the novel is the building of Far Eastern Russia, with all the difficulties involved: the heroes—the people by whose efforts this gigantic task was begun. The development of this eastern territory was not merely an economic necessity, but a military one. England, according to Pavlenko, was dying, and Japan was preparing to try to take her place. The U.S.S.R. would inevitably come to grips with Japan. So strong is the author's conviction on this point, that in the last half of the book, he envisages this war of the future, which he felt would begin in the 1940's.

Right or wrong in the light of future history, this attitude which must have been widespread in the U.S.S.R., sheds some light on the Stalin-Hitler pact. But the first part of the book, in view of what is happening today, is by far the most interesting, because in showing the Russian people at work on such a vast project, it gives some idea of what is behind the spirit which has so astonished the whole world at the present time.

As in a good many Russian novels, the plot is rather hazy and winds its tortuous way from the opening chapters on to the end. You get the impression of thousands of people moving eastward from European Russia, others from the south, mingling together in construction camps and collective farms; some doing espionage work in China and Japan. The Red army is not merely a military force but a huge army composed of women as well as men, of scientists, engineers, peasants, all working together, eager to learn, ready to teach themselves a dozen crafts, and all inspired by the same ideal. To them "the frontiers of the Soviet Union were not that geographical line which existed on maps, but another . . . which passed between palaces and huts all over the world." And the palaces stood on the further side of the frontier.

It's a glowing picture of the U.S.S.R. There is no sign of the cold and ruthless logic which motivated the famous Moscow trials as shown in Koestler's "Darkness at Noon." None of the terrorism as in "Out of the Night." Something quite different—and doubtless all three versions are true. But there can be little doubt that this new something explains in part why there are no refugees in Russia today and why Hitler's time-table has had to be revised. There is plenty of humor, plenty of heroism, as well as cold horror, but there is no maudlin sentiment and no bombast in this story of a people.

Probably it won't be a best seller but it's certainly an 'ought to' for people who take the long view.

As a postscript, it should be noted that although published in English in 1938, it was chosen this year as September book of the month, by the Labor book club in England.

M.I.T.

Miscellany

AT SUMMER'S END: Amelia Wensley; The Ryerson Press; pp. 8; 50c.

MOST OF THE NINE POEMS which make up this chapbook have the western prairie country as their physical background. They are all fragmentary, both in mood and thought-content, and are all written in a loose kind of free verse. The extreme brevity of some of the lines occasionally achieves poignancy; the weak ending of others merely conveys an effect of breathlessness. The imagery tends to be decorative in form:

" . . . stooks like
golden loafers
leaned negligent
upon a tawny field . . . "

and anthropomorphic in character:

"A handsbreadth mirror-pool . . .
Setting in blue
The shining torso of a tree . . . "

However, this work must be credited with a satisfying directness of approach and a fine awareness of sensory appeals. Revolt against the present-day tendency to mechanize life itself is indicated in "A Bird Is An Outmoded Thing" (which was published in *The Canadian Forum*.) The last stanza of "October's Tune" will suggest the author's lyrical responsiveness to nature:

"Confess—
It is from you
I part—
Ache and regret
For you, not leafy summer
Striking bronze castanets
Upon my heart."

ALAN CREIGHTON

PRIMER INFORME PRESIDENCIAL: Manuel Avila Camacho; Chamber of Deputies Press; Mexico.

GENERAL MANUEL AVILA CAMACHO outlines the policy of his government in "Primer Informe Presidencial," his inaugural speech to the Mexican Congress.

"Mexico," he says, "is not an aggressive country. We are pacifist by nature but we are jealous of our national sovereignty. Should it, should the unity of the Americas, should our right to think and to work each in our own way be threatened, Mexico would have no choice." He suggests a permanent Inter-American Council to settle inter-American disputes by arbitration. Mexican and United States air bases can be used by either nation in case of need with certain definite limitations. Mexico is the only large Latin American country to accept the Uruguayan proposal that American nations at war on other continents should be given all the advantages of non-belligerents by their sister republics. This would mean that Canada (were she in the Pan-American Union) and the U.S. would have free access to the ports of Latin America, if they were at war with any country outside the western hemisphere.

Half the nation's arable land is parcelled out in 50-100 acre lots among 600,000 peasants into co-operative and collective farms, which are provided with agricultural machinery, free pasteurization plants, sawmills, cattle

serums, free transport on national railways. Government markets cut out the middle man. Camacho is pursuing the policy initiated by his predecessor, Cardenas, during the latter months of his regime, of giving the peasants title deeds to their lands although a few collective (State) farms remain, notably those of the Spanish Loyalist refugees. New farms are continually being cut out of hitherto unsurveyed forest and reclaimed land. All this is accompanied by a costly irrigation system and electrical and road development. [It is Camacho's boast that today many a mestizo brings his goods to market on a white man's road where he formerly knew only a mule-track.] A whole year's work on the Campeche-Chetumal road resulted in only twelve kilometres due to the unhealthiness and density of the jungle.

Exports to Europe have dropped from 50% to .9% of Mexican export trade. Camacho suggests government production of raw materials and has established price control boards, minimum wage regions. Oil fields are nationalized. Their profits are turned into state hospitals, clinics, etc. for their workmen. Begging, Mexico's curse due to accompanying leprosy, prostitution and venereal disease are being fought, not only with legislation but with state hospitals, restaurants, rest-homes, clinics. Another traditional curse he eradicates by forbidding the army to take part in political organizations of any kind. Elementary, vocational, co-operative schools get 10% of the budget, and the Workers' University a grant to continue its courses in Marxist interpretation of history, economics, sociology. University training is free to the student willing to work on a government project after graduation, for a year, in exchange for his board. "Equality of opportunity," concludes the president, "is the keynote of Mexican democracy."

In his reply to the president of the republic, Carillo, president of the chamber, editor of the Socialist "El Popular" and professor in the Workers' University, calls upon the Americas to unite not to isolate themselves from, but to take a responsible part in world affairs.

"A people without an ideal is a dead people. Mexico and Latin America must stand beside the peoples opposing fascism. Free men of the world unite to save humanity from aggression, to guarantee peace, concord, progress."

JOSEPHINE HAMBLETON

OXFORD PERIODICAL HISTORY OF THE WAR, Nos. 8 and 9: Edgar McInnis; Oxford, for Canadian Institute of International Affairs; 84 and 68 pp.; each, 25c.

THE LATEST NUMBERS of Prof. McInnis' excellent running history of the war cover the periods April to June and July to September respectively. Thus No. 8 takes in the Battle of the Balkans, including the evacuation of Greece and Crete, and ends with the beginning of the German invasion of Russia. No. 9 deals with the Russian campaign up to the end of September, taking in developments in the stiffening American attitude, the "Atlantic Charter," aid to Russia and the growing revolts in the occupied countries, with some account of British air activity in the west. The merit of Prof. McInnis' masterly summaries is that they go beyond the mere chronicling of events, and seek to synthesize and interpret, from authentic sources, the many phases of war activity which are apt to present so confusing a picture to the ordinary newspaper reader. Required reading for anyone who wishes to maintain a proper perspective on the course of the war.

C. M.

Books Received

Voices Of Victory: (Representative Poetry of Canada in War-time); Macmillan; pp. 97; \$1.50.

Land and Labor: George V. Haythorne, Leonard C. Marsh; Oxford (McGill University—Social Research Studies); pp. 568; \$4.00.

Hitler's Counterfeit Reich: Dr. Karl Robert; Longmans, Green (Alliance); pp. 122; \$1.35.

Out of the People: J. B. Priestley; Macmillan (Harper & Bros.); pp. 160; \$2.00.

Satan In Top Hat: Tibor Koeves; Longmans, Green (Alliance); pp. 359; \$4.00.

We Have Been There: Broadcast on the CBC National Network; CBC; pp. 144; 25c.

Stars and Strikes: Murray Ross; Columbia Univ. Press; pp. 233; \$2.75 (U.S.A.).

At Summer's End: Amelia Wensley; pp. 8; 50c.

The League of Nations and Raw Materials 1919-1939: Karl W. Kapp; Geneva Research Centre; pp. 64; 40c.

The British Columbia Fisheries: W. A. Carrothers; Univ. of Toronto Press; pp. 136; \$2.00.

A Generation of Materialism 1871-1900: Carlton J. H. Hayes; Musson Book Company (Harper & Bros.); pp. xii & 390; \$5.00.

The Story of Modern Art: Sheldon Cheney; Macmillan (Viking); pp. 643; \$6.50.

A Young Man Views the War: E. M. Pullan; C. K. Publishing Co.; pp. 48.

Men of Europe: André Simone; McLeod (Modern Age, N.Y.C.); pp. 330; \$3.25.

Five Centuries of Polish Learning: Stanislaw Kot (English version by William J. Rose); Basil Blackwell; pp. 53; 50c.

The Real Life of Sebastian Knight: Vladimir Nabokov; New Directions; pp. 205; \$2.50 (U.S.A.).

Argentina and the United States: Clarence H. Haring; World Peace Foundation; pp. 77; cloth 50c; paper 25c (U.S.A.).

The Doctors Mayo: H. B. Clapesattle; Collins (Univ. of Minnesota Press); pp. 712; \$4.50.

They Were San Franciscans: Miriam Allen de Ford; Caxton; pp. 321; \$3.50 (U.S.A.).

The Soviets Expected It: Anna Louise Strong; Longmans (Dial Press); pp. 279; \$3.

Ten Angels Swearing: Francis Williams; The Labor Book Service (Routledge); pp. 205; .90 (LBS members).

PAMPHLETS

The War and Opinion (reprinted from U. of T. Quarterly): C. E. Silcox; pp. 45.

Collective Bargaining in Canada: Bora Laskin; Food For Thought Series, C.A.A.E.; pp. 19; 10c.

The Universities Are Dangerous: W. E. C. Harrison; Oxford; pp. 55; 25c.

Canada At War (revised to Nov. 1st): Director of Public Information, Ottawa; pp. 71; issued free.

Geografia Economica: Ana Maria Reyna.

Historia de la Epoca del Capitalismo Industrial: A. Epinov and N. Freiberg, translated by A. M. Reyna.

El Panorama de la Ciencia: R. L. Worral, translated by A. M. Reyna.

The Oil Conflict in Mexico: (These four from the Workers' University Press, Mexico City).

Macmillan War Pamphlets Canadian Series — 10c each

Contemporary Verse, A Canadian Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 1, Sept. 1941: Editor, Alan Crawley, Caulfield P.O., B.C.; pp. 14; 25c a copy, \$1 a year.

Old Country Mail (Third Series): R. S. Lambert; C.B.C.; pp. 60; 25c.

Primer Informe Presidencial: Manuel Avila Camacho; Mexico, D. F.—Imprenta de la Camara de Diputados —1941; pp. 126.

The Saskatchewan Poetry Book: Saskatchewan Poetry Society, Regina; pp. 35; 35c.

How To Buy Life Insurance: Maxwell S. Stewart; Public Affairs; pp. 32; 10c (U.S.A.).

India, The War and Canada: H. S. Polak; C.A.A.E.; pp. 16; 10c.

Canada to The United States: Four international broadcasts by Leonard W. Brockington, director of public information, Ottawa; pp. 30.

Basic Science Education Series: Bertha Morris Parker and Thomas Park; The Copp Clark Company (Row, Peterson and Co., U.S.A.); pp. 36; 35c.

Clouds, Rain and Snow.

Animal Travels.

The Sky Above Us.

Stories Read From The Rocks.

COIN COLLECTORS

Read "The Numismatist". Big monthly magazine with news and feature articles on coins, medals and paper money. 54th year. Subscription \$3.25 per year. Sample copy 30c. Write for circular, The American Numismatic Association, 99 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York.

MONTRÉAL

New and renewal subscriptions for The Canadian Forum can be paid through
ASSOCIATE LITERATURE SERVICE
307 York Bldg., 1502 St. Catherine St. W., Telephone WE. 3882.
Nights AT. 4859

1-42

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

THE CANADIAN FORUM

SUBSCRIPTION DEPARTMENT

28 WELLINGTON STREET WEST
TORONTO, CANADA

Send The Canadian Forum for

one year \$2

two years \$3

To

Address

New Renewal

Please send postal note or
money order, or make cheque
payable at par in Toronto.

New or Renewal Subscriptions
can be paid at any

**CANADIAN NATIONAL
TELEGRAPH'S OFFICE**

at no extra cost

This form, or a copy of it,
— must be used —

 HAVE THIS STUB
RECEIPTED

RECEIVED PAYMENT

Amount

Date

..... for Canadian National Telegraphs

THE CANADIAN FORUM

1-42

History's Most Momentous Year?

No matter what the wild waves are saying . . .

WAVES of hearsay, anxiety, jubilation . . . air waves, talk waves, waves of printer's ink! *The Canadian Forum* will help you to keep the record straight, to breast the clouds of verbal spray waiting to engulf you in this stormiest year in history, 1942.

This thoughtful forward looking journal of comment and criticism, now in its twenty-first year of publication, will bring you each month a reasoned discussion of affairs from a progressive Canadian point of view. A guaranteed corrective of mental and emotional astigmatism. Sign up now! Start the year right by subscribing to

THE
CANADIAN FORUM
CANADA'S PROGRESSIVE MAGAZINE

SIGN UP

for the duration

. . . for the duration of 1942, at least, or better still, for two years at the economical rate of \$3. Just mail this coupon with your cheque or money order: *The Canadian Forum*, 28 Wellington St. W., Toronto.

Please send me *The Canadian Forum* as indicated below:

(1 year, \$2.00
(2 years, \$3.00

Name

Address

.....

Books « » Pamphlets

Subscriptions to any Publication

may be ordered through the

Canadian Forum Book Service
28 Wellington Street West, Toronto, Canada

PLEASE ADD POSTAGE FOR PAMPHLETS ONLY AND 11 PERCENT FOR ANY PUBLICATION WHICH MUST BE PAID FOR IN U.S. FUNDS. MONEY ORDER OR POSTAL NOTE, OR CHEQUE PAYABLE AT PAR SHOULD BE SENT.

